DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 682 RC 002 581

LAW SCHOOL PREPARATORY PROGRAM FOR COLLEGE GRADUATES OF SPANISH-AMERICAN DESCENT. PROGRESS REPORT TO THE FORD FOUNDATION.

Denver Univ., Colo.

Spons Agency-Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.

Pub Date 1 Sep 67

Note-86p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.52

Descriptors-COMPETITIVE SELECTION, CONSULTANTS, COURSE DESCRIPTIONS, *EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS, GRADUATE STUDY, INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING, INSTRUCTIONAL TRIPS, *LAW INSTRUCTION, LAW SCHOOLS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *SCHOLARSHIPS, *SPANISH AMERICANS, SUMMER PROGRAMS, TEACHING ASSISTANTS, TESTING, TUTORIAL PROGRAMS

Identifiers-*Rocky Mountain Region

The Ford Foundation funded an experimental program at the University of Denver College of Law in the summer of 1967 to prepare Spanish-American college graduates to enter law school, the ultimate purpose being to increase the number of Spanish-American lawyers in the Rocky Mountain area. Twenty student participants were selected on the basis of academic achievement, extracurricular activities and interests, and personal situation of the applicant. Basic law courses in Criminal Law, Criminal Procedure, and Contracts were offered without credit. Teaching assistants conducted individual counseling sessions and assisted with class instruction and group tutorial sessions. Eleven students were selected for scholarships and admission to law school on the basis of academic achievement during the summer program. The program will continue over a 3-year period. (JEH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RECEIVED
JUL 29 1968
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

COLLEGE OF LAW

PROGRESS REPORT

TO

THE FORD FOUNDATION

LAW SCHOOL PREPARATORY PROGRAM

For

COLLEGE GRADUATES OF SPANISH-AMERICAN DESCENT

William S. Huff, Director
University of Denver
College of Law
Denver, Colorado 80204

September 1, 1967

ED021682

RC002581

"Though reason's victories are partial and its strength always tentative, it is--this side of God's assistance--the most attractive, most promising force we have."

Nathan M. Pusey
The Age of the Scholar

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I Introduction

II Objectives of the Program

III Dissemination of Information

IV Selection of Students for Summer Program

V Faculty and Teaching Assistants

VI Conduct of the Summer Program

- A. Orientation
- B. Course Work
    - 1. Criminal Law
    - 2. Criminal Procedure
    - 3. Contracts
- C. Law School Admission Tests
- D. Report of Professor Anthony Gary Dworkin
- E. Extracurricular Activities

VII Academic Results and Scholarships Awarded

VIII Analysis of Students by Instructors

IX Problems Encountered

X Suggestions for Continuing Program

XI Conclusion

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Information Bulletin for Students

Appendix B - Application Form

Appendix C - List of Colleges and Universities Contacted

Appendix D - Ford Foundation Press Release

Appendix E - University of Denver Press Release

Appendix F - Additional Information Concerning Students

Appendix G - Faculty and Teaching Assistants

Appendix H - Book List and First Assignments

Appendix I - Class Schedule

Appendix J - Recommended Study Guide

Appendix K - Final Examinations and Critiques

Appendix L - LSAT Results

I

INTRODUCTION

On March 20, 1967, Dean Robert B. Yegge of the University of Denver College of Law submitted a proposal to the Ford Foundation for the conduct of a special summer preparatory program for college graduates of Spanish-American descent. The program was designed to be experimental, to continue over a three-year period, with its purpose being to increase the number of lawyers of Spanish-American descent in the Rocky Mountain Region. On April 6, 1967 the Ford Foundation notified the University of Denver that a grant of $150,000 had been made to support the program. The grant's design was to conduct a summer program in 1967 for twenty college graduates of Spanish-American descent, providing funds for the proper administration of the program, and for twenty scholarships for the summer participants, covering their tuition, books and subsistence. In addition, the grant was to provide scholarships for three years of law school study for up to twelve students, to be chosen from among the twenty summer participants. These scholarships also would cover the cost of tuition, books and subsistence.

A description of the program in the form of an Information Bulletin for Students was prepared at the College of Law. It was designed for distribution through colleges and universities, organizations active in the Spanish-American community, and to interested individuals.[1] An application form was also prepared,[2] and solicitation of applications was begun immediately after the University of Denver was given notification of the grant.

---

1. See Appendix A for a copy of the Information Bulletin.
2. See Appendix B for a copy of the Application Form.

The planned special session was to be coterminous with the regular summer session at the College of Law, which was to commence in mid-June, so there was a considerable press to select twenty students for attendance. As indicated, up to twelve of these students were to be selected at the close of the summer, based upon their academic performance and demonstrated promise during the summer, for admission to the College of Law in September, 1967 as regular first-year students. The twenty students selected for the summer session received full scholarships, covering their tuition, the cost of their books, and a living stipend of $300. The students selected for admission to the College of Law in September were to receive similar scholarships throughout their law school careers so long as they maintained a satisfactory academic standing.

The summer session closed on Friday, August 18, 1967, and eleven of the summer students were selected for admission to the College of Law. All of those selected have accepted.

This progress report is designed to explain the program conducted, and to evaluate, insofar as our present perspective allows, the summer program and the students participating in it. Another report will be prepared at the close of the 1967-68 academic year. At that time report can be made upon the progress of the eleven scholarship students during their first year of law study.

II

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM

The proposal made by Dean Yegge was grounded in the fact that there is a large Spanish-American community in the Rocky Mountain Region and that few of the attorneys in the region are of Spanish-American descent. The statistical breakdown varies, of course, from community to community. However, as an example, approximately 9% of the City and County of Denver's population are of Spanish-American descent, but of over 2,000 lawyers in the metropolitan area, less than 10 are of Spanish-American descent.

While it has never been an aim of the program that there should be an exact percentage correlation between the number of Spanish-American lawyers in the legal community and the number of Spanish-Americans in the total community, it seems obvious that so great a discrepancy as indicated by the Denver figures evidences a lack and a need.

As indicated in the proposal and the grant, it was felt that additional Spanish-American attorneys could be of great service to the Spanish-American community, assure competent counsel and advice to, and the protection of the rights of, the members of the community. Lawyers traditionally have been active in business, politics, civic affairs, and public administration. Legal training for students of Spanish-American descent would tend naturally to extend the life of the community and to give the members of the community a greater and stronger voice in each of these areas. It was also felt that the presence of young Spanish-American lawyers in the community could have only a salutary effect upon the ambitions and aspirations of other young Spanish-Americans.

We are in no position to explain with precision why there are so few Spanish-American attorneys at the present time. Undoubtedly, it is but a small part of the larger and general picture of relatively lower educational achievements by those of the Spanish-American community. It would appear, based upon the Law School Admission Test scores of the twenty students oritinally selected for participation in the summer program, that most of the summer participants would not have been admitted to the College of Law had they applied in the regular fashion.[3] However, having been given the opportunity to participate in a quarter of law school study, to be observed and assisted by the faculty, and to demonstrate their capabilities for fulfilling the academic requirements, some of these same students have now been admitted to the College of Law. And, there is good indication these students will be able to perform satisfactorily the work to be required in the future.

This has not yet taken into account what seemed to be an ever present factor in the application forms and that is the need for economic assistance, which the present program also provides in good measure.

A question often presented by those outside the program, and also by many of the students participating in it, is whether the successful summer candidates, and ultimate graduates of the College of Law, will be expected to be attorneys for the Spanish-American community in some direct manner; that is to say, whether they must participate in some poverty program as legal counsel, work for a legal aid society, conduct a private practice greatly limited to the community, or the like. No formal requirement or condition of this sort was made a part of the program. Indeed, no informal requirement was made. No student was told this would be expected of him. Of course, the very foundation of the proposal and the grant made in response to it indicate a hope that at least some of the successful candidates of this program will actively assist in gaining representation in all community affairs for those of the Spanish-American community. However, it seems safe to say that the basic aim of the program is to educate young Spanish-Americans as lawyers. We presume that this itself is a positive goal and that its accomplishment would necessarily have its positive effect upon the Spanish-American community, both directly and indirectly. Certainly, most of the students participating in the program are not unaware of the problems of Spanish-Americans in the Rocky Mountain Region; many have indicated a strong desire, once having graduated from law school, to take an active part in their alleviation.

---

[3] See Paragraph C, Section VI of this Report for a discussion of the LSAT scores.

Attacking the educational deprivation and resultant difficulties of a large minority cannot be done easily but the problems cannot be met with indifference. This program demonstrated an absence of indifference on the part of many.

We have placed our trust in the fact that the eventual sound results of a successful educational venture will never be inconsiderable. It is our desire that from this program and its graduates will come increased knowledge and good works.

III

DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

Early in March, 1967, letters were directed to eighteen colleges and universities in the Rocky Mountain Region indicating that a pre-law program for students of Spanish-American descent might be conducted at the College of Law in the summer of 1967. The president of each institution was requested to select a faculty member or administrator to serve as a contact representative for the dissemination of information on the proposed program to interested students. Twelve of the eighteen institutions contacted[4] complied with the request and furnished the College of Law with the name of a representative. A few of the representatives had already managed to canvass their respective student bodies and immediately reported they had no interested or at least no eligible students. The Information Bulletin for Students and the Application Form were furnished, in an adequate number of copies, to the representative at each of the remaining institutions for distribution to interested students.

---

[4] See Appendix C for a list of the colleges and universities contacted.

In addition, a copy of the Information Bulletin was sent to each of thirteen members of the Coordinating Council of the Governor's Office of Economic Opportunity. A large number of copies of both the Information Bulletin and the Application Form were also sent to Mr. Samuel R. Martinez, Director of the Governor's Office of Economic Opportunity, for distribution to all Colorado organizations interested in Spanish-American community affairs.

A press release issued from the offices of the Ford Foundation was made available for release on Thursday, April 20, 1967, and it appeared in newspapers in the Denver area, and elsewhere, on that and subsequent dates.[5]

Subsequently, a press release was prepared by the Public Relations Office of the University of Denver for distribution to daily and weekly newspapers in smaller Colorado and in New Mexico communities.[6]

The Application Form, which had been earlier prepared, bore a deadline date of May 1, 1967. Since the summer session at the College of Law was scheduled to begin in mid-June, it was felt that every effort must be given to make the selection decisions by mid-May, in order that preparations could be made to receive the students and in order that each student selected would have time to make his plans for coming to Denver.

Events proved that local newspaper publicity was the most effective soli-

---

5. See Appendix D for a copy of this press release.
6. See Appendix E for a copy of this press release.

citor of applications. This publicity did not occur until late April; hence, the May 1 deadline for the receipt of applications was not realistic. While the formal application deadline of May 1 was never altered, in the belief there could hardly be a proper end to such changes, inquirers were encouraged, both before and after May 1, to submit their application and accompanying materials[7] as quickly as possible.

The director and the three summer faculty members, who served as an Admissions Committee, continued to delay their meetings until very close to mid-May.

As indicated, it would seem that the most effective publicity was newspaper publicity. While representatives from colleges were, in a few instances, very productive of applicants, it is estimated that three quarters of the total number of applicants were alerted to the conduct of the program by newspapers, or by relatives who learned of the program through newspapers. Indeed, an estimated one-half of the applicants were not in college, or were not in one of the colleges with a contact representative, at the time they made application. Thus, it would seem that in the future stress should be placed upon obtaining as wide newspaper coverage as possible. This is not to indicate that an appropriate and successful attempt was not made this summer past.

The program was publicized nationally also, receiving mention in the June 19, 1967 issue of Newsweek magazine and in several newspapers outside the region. The June 1, 1967 Vista Bulletin also covered the conduct of the program for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

---

[7] Each applicant was asked to complete the application (See Appendix B), and to supply a copy of his college transcript for each school previously attended, a photograph of himself, and at least one letter of recommendation from someone of his choosing.

IV

SELECTION OF STUDENTS FOR SUMMER PROGRAM

A total of seventy-nine applications were received for the twenty positions in the summer program to be filled. This was an extremely active and gratifying response to the program. The response alone would seem to have some probative value in support of the proposition that this program was sorely needed.

Written inquiries arrived from thirteen states and the District of Columbia concerning participation in the program.[8] There were a total of one hundred twenty-three written inquiries, and there were a goodly number of local and long distance telephonic inquiries which went unrecorded.

Applications for admission to the summer program were received from eight states: New Mexico (38); Colorado (29); Texas (7); Arizona (1); California (1); Nebraska (1); Washington (1); and Wyoming (1). Of the seventy-nine applications received, the files of six applicants remained incomplete and were not pressed to a decision. Fifteen of the seventy-nine applicants were ineligible because they had not yet received, and were not due to receive in the spring of 1967, a baccalaureate degree, which is a requirement for admission to the College of Law. Of these fifteen applicants, six were merely high school graduates, or else were freshmen or sophomores in college. The remaining nine were due to graduate from college in the near future, but not in sufficient time to participate in the

---

[8] The states are: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, Texas, Washington, and Wyoming.

1967 summer program. All applicants who were presently ineligible were immediately notified of their ineligibility. Each was encouraged to consider pursuing a legal education in the future and was invited to inquire concerning attendance at the University of Denver College of Law after completing college.

Two applicants were denied admission because they were already students in a law school, and it was felt that by its very nature a preparatory program was not, of course, designed for their particular needs. The faculty felt the program should be designed to reach those students who, for economic or other reasons, would not have considered law school study, or who would have been deterred from pursuing a legal education for reasons the program could obviate. There were approximately eight applicants who, because of their age or the size of their families, or both, were rejected. It was thought their other obligations simply would not allow them the required time and attention to devote full-time to the study of law.

Subtracting all of the above applicants who were denied admission, there were left forty-eight applicants for the twenty summer positions to be filled.

Several meetings of the Admissions Committee were held to deliberate upon the remaining applications. In making selections, of course, we had in mind as our goal the selection of those twenty persons whom we felt were most likely to succeed in the study of law. On reflection, it would seem that there were actually three main areas of consideration--(1) academic background and ability, (2) extracurricular college activities, demonstrated interests, and work background, and (3) the personal situation of the applicant, i.e., age and family status, etc. Of course, we wanted persons who seemed most academically qualified. However, among this group there were possibly individuals who were considerably older, married and who had from one to a number of children. Our thinking was that any candidate for the summer program, and any student accepted in the College of Law after completion of the summer program, should be in a position to devote full-time to law studies, untroubled by financial difficulties or other anxieties. This, of course, militated in favor of younger and single students.

Of the twenty students originally selected by the Admissions Committee, two declined the offer extended to them--one because of a previous contract to teach in a junior college beginning in September, 1967, and the other because he had decided to undertake graduate work in a different discipline. Two additional offers were made to fill the places created by these declinations, and the two alternate candidates accepted.

One of the original twenty offers was tentatively made, pending receipt of more information about the applicant. When this information was received, it appeared he was not a college graduate and would not be a graduate by June, 1967. No final offer was extended to him; his position was taken by yet another alternate candidate who accepted.

Thus, prior to the commencement of the summer program, a group of twenty students, each of whom had indicated his acceptance of our scholarship and admission offer, had been selected. Of these twenty students, one did not appear on June 16, 1967, the date set for the first gathering of students at the College of Law for orientation. The student was contacted by telephone on June 19, and he informed us that he could not, because of family reasons, participate in the program. Immediately an offer was made to an alternate candidate (who had previously been notified of his non-acceptance)[9] to take this declining student's place, and the latter offer was accepted.

---

[9] This is student number 15 in Appendix F.

During the first week of the program, on the second day of classes, another of the original twenty students decided to withdraw from the program. Since only two days of classes had elapsed, the faculty chose to fill his position with another alternate candidate, who accepted and began work immediately.[10]

At the close of the first week of classes, June 23, 1967, yet another student decided to withdraw from the program. Since these were such valuable positions, it was decided an offer should be made to another alternate candidate. The position of this second withdrawing student was also filled with an accepting candidate.[11]

At the beginning of the second week of the program, the faculty decided that should there be any further withdrawals, the positions would have to remain vacant. Because of the intensive nature of the summer program, and the speed with which the course material was being covered, it was felt that a student arriving any later than had our third alternate candidate would be placed at a decided disadvantage in his competition with his fellow students. He would be too far behind in his course work to have a fair opportunity for success.

Two more of the twenty students, as the group was comprised at the start of the second week of classes, did in fact withdraw before the conclusion of the summer program.[12] Each of these students was counseled at length by the director of the program after having indicated a desire to leave, but each felt that a combination of personal problems and academic pressures of the

---

10. This is student number 2 in Appendix F.
11. This is student number 7 in Appendix F.
12. These are students numbers 16 and 20 in Appendix F. Student number 20 withdrew June 26 and student number 16 withdrew July 11.

program necessitated his leaving.

Set forth in Appendix F is a list of the twenty students participating in the summer program, as the group was comprised at the start of the second week of classes. The students are listed by number only. Each student is described by age, sex, his marital and family status, birth place, permanent address and college education. Also given are the occupation and educational level of each of his parents, his undergraduate grade point, and his scores on Law School Admission Tests. His course marks, grade average in the summer program, and his summer class ranking are given at the close.

V

FACULTY AND TEACHING ASSISTANTS

William S. Huff, Assistant Professor of Law, was selected by Dean Robert B. Yegge to serve as the Director of the Summer Program. Three additional members of the faculty of the College of Law were selected to comprise the faculty for the Special Summer Preparatory Program: Professor Harold E. Hurst, Professor John Phillip Linn, and Associate Professor Lawrence P. Tiffany.[13]

Because of a decision to conduct tutorials in each course, and to make available instructional help at all times to the summer students,[14] each faculty member selected a senior law student, or in the case of Professor Linn, a recent graduate, to serve as a teaching assistant for his course.

Working with Professor Hurst was James E. Rode, a senior law student, whose home is Evansville, Indiana. Mr. Rode is a 1965 graduate of Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Indiana, where he majored in Political Science and minored in History. Mr. Rode is a senior at the College of Law, a member of the Denver Law Journal staff, and a scholarship student.

Working with Professor Linn was Frank F. Skillern, Esq., a December, 1966 graduate of the College of Law, and a member of the Colorado Bar.

---

[13] See Appendix G for further information on the faculty.
[14] See Paragraph B, Section VI of this Report.

Mr. Skillern is very interested in continuing his legal education at a graduate level, with a goal of assuming a teaching position in a law school.

Working with Professor Tiffany was Miss Sara J. Beery. Miss Beery is a senior at the College of Law and a member of the Denver Law Journal staff, as well as being a scholarship student. She is a 1959 graduate of Wittenberg, College, Springfield, Ohio, where she majored in English and Social Studies. Miss Beery has also been a Peace Corps volunteer, serving in the Phillipines as an English teacher.

Arrangements were made for the faculty and teaching assistants to have lunch together each Wednesday at noon, beginning during the second week of the program, on June 28, and continuing each week throughout the program, having the last luncheon meeting on Wednesday, August 9. This provided an opportunity for the seven persons closely involved in the operation of the program to meet together at least once each week to discuss the progress of the program and any problems which might have arisen.

It was early decided that these meetings would be more valuable if, whenever possible, a representative of the Spanish-American community could have luncheon with us. This provided an opportunity to learn more about the problems and attitudes of the Spanish-American community, to anticipate potential difficulties in the program, and to take corrective steps.

On Wednesday, July 5, our luncheon meeting had as its guest Professor Anthony Gary Dworkin, a sociologist from Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois. Professor Dworkin's activities in connection with the program are fully discussed in Paragraph D of Section VI hereof.

On July 12 and July 19, respectively, we had as our guests Donald N. Pacheco, Esq. and Roger Cisneros, Esq., attorneys of Spanish-American descent who are in private practice in Denver. Both Mr. Pacheco and Mr. Cisneros subsequently addressed the summer students at the law school; this is discussed in Paragraph E of Section VI of this Report.

On Wednesday, August 2, the faculty had as its guest Mr. Samuel R. Martinez, the Director of the Governor's Office of Economic Opportunity.

During these meetings, our guests discussed with us in this very informal prandial setting their impressions of the program, the need for such a project, the problems we might anticipate, and some of the difficulties and frustrations of the Spanish-American community. Endorsement of the program by members of the community with whom we spoke was uniform. The need for Spanish-American attorneys, even more urgent in rural areas, seemed clamant.

VI

CONDUCT OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM

A. Orientation

The students in the summer program were asked to arrive in Denver in sufficient time to be prepared to attend an orientation and registration meeting at the College of Law at 1:00 p.m. on Friday, June 16, 1967. As indicated earlier, nineteen of the twenty students who were selected prior to the commencement of the program were present for this meeting. They were registered with both the College of Law and with the University of Denver at this time.

At this meeting, held in the Lawyer's Lounge of the College of Law, the students had their first opportunity to meet each other, the members of the summer faculty and the teaching assistants. A brief welcoming address was given by Dean Yegge.

The students were given listings of their fellow students, class schedules, their first class assignments, tutorial group assignments, and recommended time-study guides for a typical week of the program. The books for each of the three courses were distributed at this meeting, and the students were conducted on a complete tour of the law school.

On Saturday, June 17, each of these nineteen students took the Law School Admission Test. A special arrangement had been made with the Educational Testing Service for the administration of a test for this group of students alone. The summer students were also scheduled to take the Law School Admission Test at the regularly programmed time for its summer administration, Saturday, August 5, 1967.[15]

B. Course Work

Classes for the Special Summer Preparatory Program commenced on Monday morning, June 19, which was also the first day of the regularly scheduled summer session for the College of Law. As is typical of law school arrangements, the students in the summer program were expected to be, and were, prepared for participation in their first class meetings. They had been instructed at the orientation meeting on the preceding Friday that this would be expected of them, and that they would have Sunday, June 18, in which to accomplish their preparation.

On Tuesday afternoon, June 20, the students were given a rather extensive tour of the library by Mrs. Martha Peacock, the Assistant Librarian for the College of Law. They were instructed concerning where to find, and how to use, the more basic legal research tools, including the Colorado statutes, the case reports in the West system, the legal encyclopedias and textbooks.

---

[15] See Paragraph C of this section of the Report for a discussion of the LSAT results.

The College of Law operates on the Honor Code system and the students participating in the summer program were similarly bound. Each student participating in the summer program was given a copy of the Student Handbook, which contains a reprint of the Honor Code. He was directed to read and familiarize himself with the code. He was asked to sign an agreement acknowledging that he had received a copy of the code, had read and understood it, and would be governed by its provisions throughout all periods of his registration in the College of Law.

At organizational meetings before the commencement of the program, it had been decided that the academic approach of the preparatory program would be to offer three regular law school courses to the summer students. For this purpose, there were selected courses often characterized as basic courses: Criminal Law, Criminal Procedure and Contracts. It was decided that the summer courses would be non-credit in nature, which is to say that any successful summer candidate, selected to attend the College of Law in September, would not be given any credit toward graduation for having taken the summer courses. For this reason no summer course had to serve as a substitute substantive course, since even the successful summer candidates would be repeating those courses during his law school career. Hence, it was felt each course could be somewhat truncated, in each professor's discretion, as compared to the substantive coverage in the regular course bearing the same name. The thinking was that this method would allow each student to be exposed to the process of the briefing of cases, class recitation and other class participation, the Socratic method, independent research in the subject matter of the course, written paper requirements in the subject, and to intermediate and final examinations in each course. In order to teach effectively the nature of law study, and in order for the student to acquire the skills of effective law study, some substantive courses, to be ably and imaginatively presented, had to be chosen as media.

Our aim in planning and in execution was to prevent the academics of the summer program from becoming dull and cheerless labor. A vigorous attempt was made to capture the imagination of each student by the intellectual challenge which the study of law presents and to hold it captive with the sincerity of our concern for his progress.

Each of the three courses was designed as if it were a three-hour course, meeting three times each week during the summer session. In addition to the regular classroom work, a system was devised whereby we could augment the class work and at the same time have closer contact with individual students. To this end, a tutorial session for each course was planned. The summer students were divided into three tutorial groups (seven students in each of two groups and six in the remaining group). Each group was assigned certain hours each week for three one-hour tutorial sessions with the respective professor and teaching assistant for each substantive course. Thus, each student attended nine hours of class each week (three hours for each course), and he also had three hours per week devoted to tutorial sessions (one tutorial session for each of the three courses).

From the professor's standpoint this arrangement meant he was to teach three classes each week, and that he was to conduct three tutorial sessions each week (one session for each of the three tutorial groups).[16]

In the main, the tutorial sessions seemed to work quite well. Every student was provided thus with an opportunity to have an extra hour's work each week in each subject matter. He had an opportunity to work with a smaller group in a more intensive study of the materials covered that week, or else he had a chance to discuss problems raised, but unresolved, in the classroom work of that week.

---

[16] See Appendix I for a class schedule, listing the class meetings and tutorial sessions.

As previously noted, in the desire to work as closely as possible with each individual student, the faculty decided it would serve well to select three teaching assistants, one for each faculty member. The teaching assistant was to be available to assist his faculty member in both class and tutorial work. In addition, the teaching assistants were utilized to good service by their meeting once each week with each student, reviewing the student's work, giving him advice, and answering his questions.[17] Thus, each student had an opportunity weekly to meet with a teaching assistant in each course, spending a half-hour or more discussing both substantive law problems and study problems he might be having in the course to which the teaching assistant was assigned. In addition to these regularly scheduled meetings, it was made clear to all of the students in the summer program, on more than one occasion, that the teaching assistants were available for consultation at any time, as were the professors themselves. The faculty felt, and experience seemed to bear them out somewhat, that students might well feel less reluctance about calling upon a teaching assistant than they would upon a faculty member, despite the continued reminders of the latter's availability.

As might be expected, some of the summer students utilized the general availability of teaching assistants to a considerable extent; others did not. However, it safely can be said it is the consensus of the faculty that the

---

17. See Section V of this Report for a discussion relating to the teaching assistants.

presence of the teaching assistants made possible a much more intensive program than would otherwise have occurred. Indeed, while it cannot be documented, it is felt that the rather high level of performance of the summer students can be attributed in good part to the availability and the eagerness to teach of the teaching assistants.

The regular summer session at the College of Law is eight weeks in duration, followed by a week of scheduled examinations. The faculty of the Special Summer Preparatory Program concluded that it would be a useful teaching device to reserve time following final examinations for the conduct of a critique for the entire class of the examination in each course. It was felt this would be particularly helpful for the successful scholarship candidates, giving each faculty member a chance to review the examination and the appropriate answers, so that each student might ascertain his own strengths and weaknesses by having participated in the critique. To this end, the Special Summer Preparatory Program classes ceased on Wednesday, August 9, which was two days before the close of the regular law school summer session on Friday, August 11. With this earlier closing, the first examination in the Preparatory Program was scheduled for Friday morning, August 11. The second and third examinations were scheduled for the succeeding Monday and Wednesday, August 14 and 16, respectively. All of the examinations then had been completed by August 16, and a half a day was reserved thereafter for the critique of each examination. Thursday, August 17, and Friday morning, August 18, were set aside for this purpose.[18] Immediately after the close of the last examination critique, the faculty and the director of the program met as a Selection Committee, to pass upon the success of the summer candidates and to award scholarships, on Friday afternoon, August 18.

---

[18] See Appendix K for a copy of the final examination and examination critique schedule.

There follows a description in greater detail of the conduct of each substantive course offered in the summer program.

1. Criminal Law

Professor Harold E. Hurst used the 3rd Edition of Perkins, Cases and Materials on Criminal Law and Procedure. He chose this work because of its excellent selection of criminal law cases, with good examples of statutory changes and additions to the common law.

The breadth of subject matter of the summer course encompassed (1) crimes against the person, including homicide (murder and manslaughter), assault, battery, and robbery, and (2) crimes against property, including larceny, burglary, obtaining property by false pretenses, and embezzlement.

The class sessions were devoted to practice in case analysis, that is, isolation of the material facts, the issues, the rules of law, and reasons underlying those rules. Class time was also devoted to the use of the facts and rules of law in the process of legal reasoning, with what might be called a study of the legal syllogism and the deductive process in arriving at defensible conclusions.

The tutorial sessions were used almost exclusively for two purposes: (1) critiques of student work previously performed, e.g., briefs of cases, research papers and examinations, and (2) hypothetical problem solving, with each student being required to solve a different problem, applying the skills and rules of law acquired in the class sessions, with the added requirement that he defend his solution against the challenges of his colleagues. Professor Hurst felt the latter constituted, in essence, an oral examination, although it was not utilized as an evaluation technique.

Mr. Rode, the teaching assistant, met individually with each summer student at least once each week by appointment. The meeting was devoted to criticism and evaluation of the briefs, class notes and subject outlines prepared by the student. Mr. Rode also assisted Professor Hurst by reading every examination and research paper, making extensive written comments on each. These papers with the teaching assistant's comments were subsequently reviewed by Professor Hurst. In addition, Mr. Rode was available at all times for consultation with any student about problems of any nature which he might have, even including guidance in the use of research sources on required papers. Because of Mr. Rode's tentative desire to become a law teacher, he was given the opportunity on occasion to lead the class proceedings while Professor Hurst was present.

In the Criminal Law course, each student was required to prepare two research papers on problems assigned by the professor. These papers were to be cast essentially in the form of appellate court opinions. The first paper was intensively criticized and all students were required to rewrite their papers, and in some few instances to do more extensive research. No grade was assigned to this first effort, but a written evaluation of both the initial product and the rewritten work was retained by the professor. The second required paper was graded and returned to the students with the written comments of both the teaching assistant and the professor appended.

At the close of the first two weeks of classes the students took a trial examination. This examination was treated in the same manner as the first research paper, that is, it was commented upon and returned to the student but not graded. A mid-term examination was also administered. This examination was graded; the answer sheets were commented upon and returned to the student. A final examination was administered at the close of the summer session; this also was marked, commented upon, and returned to the students.

Prior to the final examination, a second trial or practice examination had been administered to seven of the students whose examination writing techniques as displayed in the mid-term examination were unsatisfactory.

The course grade for each student in the Criminal Law course was arrived at in the following manner: each student received a grade for his mid-term examination, for the second research paper, and each received a mark for the level of accomplishment attained in case briefing, as demonstrated by the written briefs required during the last week of the summer session; these three grades were averaged, each being given equal weight, and this average and the final examination grade, each of the two (the average of the previous three grades and the final examination grade) being given equal weight, determined the final grade for the course.

2. Criminal Procedure

Professor Lawrence P. Tiffany utilized Volume I of Miller and Dawson, Cases and Materials on Criminal Justice Administration and Related Processes as the textual material in the course on Criminal Procedure. This 1967 work is presently in mimeograph form, consisting of 376 pages, and was obtained from Washington University.

The following subjects were covered in depth during the progress of the summer course: an overview of the administration of the criminal justice system; the exclusionary rule as a control mechanism; the invocation of the criminal process, including "probably cause" and the law of arrest, the arrest warrant: requirement and current uses, police discretion not to arrest, and collateral uses of arrest; detection and investigation of crime, including the search warrant: requirements and current uses, search incidental to an arrest, bases for search other than arrest or a warrant, what constitutes a search and seizure, sanctions against unreasonable searches and seizures, and field interrogation.

No classroom innovations were involved. The students were required to brief the cases contained in the textual material; this was followed by the professor's oral classroom examination of a student's brief and of the reciting student's understanding of the case. Lecture materials were also used, and there were as well open and free discussions of the probable impact, both upon society and upon individuals, of the decisions discussed. On one occasion, Miss Beery, the teaching assistant, was allowed to conduct the class proceedings with Professor Tiffany present.

Professor Tiffany utilized three of his tutorial sessions to deal with an overview of the course in Criminal Procedure and the assignments given. He also discussed in these sessions how to outline a law school course for purposes of reviewing for examinations, and how to prepare for and take law school examinations. The balance of the tutorial sessions were devoted to the substantive materials of the course. These meetings were non-directive in nature; the students were encouraged to raise any questions presented by the course materials or by outside readings.

Professor Tiffany, upon subsequent reflection, had some question as to the relative effectiveness of his use of this approach. He feels the effectiveness of non-directed sessions is premised upon having an informal tutorial session where the students will pursue their own interests in depth, raise "non-legal" considerations, and actually obtain the assistance they need in study techniques. He felt that in fact the tutorial sessions in Criminal Procedure tended to be somewhat formal in nature. The students, it seemed, felt obliged to demonstrate their knowledge of materials already mastered, rather than perhaps exposing areas of ignorance by raising questions. There was indication, difficult to dispel, that the students felt they were being informally graded upon their efforts. This difference between what Professor Tiffany felt a tutorial session should be, and what he felt in fact it was, presented two possibilities: (1) if it were not feasible to attain an informal atmosphere between first-quarter law students and a faculty member, then the tutorial ought to avoid being a review, and ought instead to deal with new, but parallel, materials from those covered in the classroom, or (2) if the review and explore-in-depth approach is desirable, then a persistent effort should be made to break down the formality of the session. Since this was the first experiment with tutorial sessions, Professor Tiffany has good hope that any difficulties encountered in this year's program can be resolved or eliminated in the future.

The students in Criminal Procedure were required to make written briefs of all of the cases in the assigned materials prior to attending class. These written briefs were read and criticized by the teaching assistant, Miss Beery, in each student's weekly conference with her.

The class materials used draw heavily upon publications springing from the American Bar Foundation's Survey of the Administration of Criminal Justice in the United States. The format of these publications includes "illustrations," which are brief factual statements of actual occurences observed in practice, and which are designed to illustrate a particular legal problem. The students were required to prepare written statements of the legal issues presented by these illustrative fact situations. These presentations were discussed in class and they were also read and criticized by Miss Beery at the weekly conferences.

The class materials also contained textual extracts from secondary authorities. Each student was required to summarize or outline these articles for presentation at his weekly conference with the teaching assistant.

As additional work, the students in Criminal Procedure were required to read and summarize five law review articles. Written summarizations were submitted on different occasions to either Miss Beery or to Professor Tiffany. Students were also required to keep a written vocabulary list of legal terms for class use and for presentation to, and review by, Miss Beery. Six or eight recent United States Supreme Court cases bearing on the subject of criminal procedure were decided after the last revision of the class materials adopted. These cases were discussed in class and the students were strongly encouraged to brief and study them independently.

Each student was required to submit a final research paper of no less than twenty pages dealing with some aspect of law raised by the class materials on the subject of police discretion and the uses, other than for prosecution purposes, of arrest.

Two examinations were conducted during the course of the summer. The first, a two-hour examination, was administered about the middle of the term; the second was a final examination, three hours in length. Each examination was graded and a class critique was held for each examination.

3. Contracts

Professor John Phillip Linn selected Professor Lawrence M. Friedman's Contract Law in America, a Social and Economic Case Study (University of Wisconsin Press, 1965), as a text for the contracts course. In addition, each student was individually assigned twenty-eight Colorado cases (four cases per week), which he was to analyze and which he was to be prepared to discuss in class. Collectively, the students were assigned a total of five hundred and sixty cases, since each student was directed to different cases. This embraced most of the Colorado cases covered by the "Contracts" title in the reporter system.

Professor Linn attempted to cover broad perspectives of the subject of contracts, rather than attempting to develop narrow technical topics in depth. Through the use of Professor Friedman's text, the students gained a comprehensive overview of contract law as it was developed in the courts and by the legislature of Wisconsin from the state's territorial days through 1960. Professor Friedman has examined five hundred and fifty cases in Wisconsin, analyzing them first as fact situations--thus providing the details of the every day processes of social and economic history. He has then classified the same cases according to basic, abstract contract principles. Finally, Professor Friedman has identified the boundaries of the common law of contracts as a body of abstractions, diminishing due to outside pressures, particularly those of statutory encroachment.

With this uniquely broad view as a background, the summer students examined Colorado cases to determine whether there was a definite, discernible relationship between the economic, social and political moods of the community at a given period in history, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the manner in which courts will treat contractual conflicts.

After acquiring an acceptable working definition of contract, after reaching a basic understanding of the requirements for the formation of a contract, and after basic court procedure was discussed, the students began a discussion of the assigned Colorado cases as they related to specific fact categories.

The first category dealt with land transactions, which afforded the opportunity to consider land as a unique subject matter of contract. Discovery was made concerning how land had been given special legal treatment to serve the interests of feudal systems, and as the chief commodity and form of wealth when the American frontier was settled, and thus deserving of special legislative attention (e.g., statute of frauds, homestead exemption, equity of redemption). Further study was given to how land had been dealt with in home sales contracts and business leases. The legal problems arising from land contracts, as well as other types of contracts, were considered not only as drafting problems for the attorney, but, more importantly, as problems requiring the attention of the courts and legislatures. Consequently, an attempt was made to ascertain what elements seemed most decisive in molding particular results in given fact situations--for example, loyalty to legal tradition, economic or political ideology, a search for individual equity, or the pressures of public opinion. This made it possible to question what role the court could and would play, and it allowed the comparison of judicial with legislative results.

Subsequently, problems flowing from sales contracts were explored. This study allowed distinctions to be made between the concepts of "sales" law and the concepts of "contracts" law.

The summer students worked with a conditional sales contract, a chattel mortgage and a promissory note. They considered the legal concepts of illusory promises, implied warranties, confession of judgment, the foreign corporation, trade names, and the statute of frauds as a defense.

The third major type of contract taken under consideration was the labor-and-service contract. Here focus was given to such legal concepts as liquidated damages, mitigation of damages, quantum meruit, substantial performance, and restrictive covenants. Statutes dealing with the assignment of wages, occupational licensing, liens and the statute of frauds were discussed. The students also touched upon the subjects of assignments and of third-party-beneficiary contracts.

Throughout the discussion of the numerous Colorado cases, emphasis was given to the particular theory upon which an action might rest, e.g., express contract, a contract implied in fact, or quasi-contract. Attention was also given to the court's use of such malleable concepts as waiver and estoppel, and of fraud and mistake, as well as to the available forms of relief. Evidentiary problems such as the parol evidence rule and the dead-man statute were introduced through appropriate case discussions.

The classroom teaching method utilized was a blend of the Socratic method and the lecture method, with the latter's being used to cover large segments of basic material or particularly difficult subject areas.

The group tutorial sessions were utilized to consider new or related subject matter to that discussed in class, and some time was devoted to the review of examinations previously given. These meetings were not used as open and free discussion periods nor were they used to discuss the problems of individual students.

Each student in the contracts course met individually with the teaching assistant for one hour each week. This was by pre-arranged appointment and was designed to give the student the opportunity to discuss his individual problems, whether of substantive law or those involving study techniques. It also allowed the student time to probe more deeply into areas which personally interested him.

As mentioned earlier, Professor Linn's teaching assistant was a recent law graduate and a practicing attorney. Mr. Skillern was particularly interested in becoming a law teacher; for that reason an attempt was made to give him those experiences which would assist him as well as be most profitable to the students participating in the program. In addition to a one-hour weekly meeting with each student participating in the program, Mr. Skillern was allowed to prepare and present three class lectures, as well as attending every other contracts class session presented. He was given an active part in drafting and grading both the mid-term and the final examination. He was also allowed to lead one or two of the tutorial group discussion periods. It would appear that his work with students on an individual basis was particularly helpful to both the students and to Professor Linn. In the latter regard, Professor Linn was kept informed of the students' understanding of the assigned materials, and thus he could plan how to present the materials in the regular class sessions to maximum advantage. Also, Mr. Skillern's continuing identification of the students' strengths and weaknesses was especially valuable to Professor Linn. The students appeared to benefit considerably because of Mr. Skillern's personal concern for the individuals, and this allowed him to play an important counselor's role for each member of the class.

Three examinations were administered to the students in the contracts course during the summer session. The first was given to illustrate the examination process and to call attention to various examination writing techniques. This first examination was administered during the second week of classes; it was ungraded.

There was a two-hour mid-term examination, and there was a three-hour final examination given at the close of the summer session. These examinations were taken and graded anonymously, as were all of the other examinations in each course of the summer program. In the contracts course, the mid-term and the final examination together constituted the sole criterion upon which success in the course was based.

C. Law School Admission Tests

As indicated previously, nineteen students in the Special Summer Preparatory Program took the Law School Admission Test by special arrangement on Saturday, June 17. Two of these nineteen students withdrew from the program during the first week of classes, and two more of these students withdrew from the program prior to its close. Six of these nineteen students had taken the Law School Admission Test on at least one previous occasion.

The scores on this first examination ranged from a high of 503 to a low of 215. The average score for the group was 398.

Because of the emphasis which had been placed upon using performance in the summer program as the sole evaluation and scholarship selection device, these students were told prior to taking the examination that their scores would not determine their admission to the College of Law or their scholarship status at the close of the summer.

Later viewing the results of this examination, the summer faculty felt it had been a mistake to tell the students the test results would not be considered in the selection process. In such an examination the desire to do well, and the heightened tension of being in a test situation, probably favorably affect, within bounds, the results. These positive factors may have been diluted because of our having downgraded the importance of the test scores. Therefore, it is not at all certain the results of the first test are very meaningful. This negative surmise was strengthened by viewing the results obtained by those six students who had previously taken the examination on at least one other occasion. Of the six, two actually made lower scores on the June 17 examination than on their previous tests. Also, two of the nineteen students made such extremely low marks (215 and 238, respectively) that it cast further doubt on the validity of the test results.

The eighteen students who were still participating in the program on the regularly scheduled date for the administration of the Law School

Admission Test, on Saturday, August 5, again took the examination. In this group of eighteen students, three were alternate candidates, replacing those who did not appear at the start of the program or who withdrew during its first week. For these three students this was their first LSAT Test under the auspices of our program. Realizing it might make comparison with the results on the first examination, administered June 17, even more difficult, it was decided that the students taking this second examination should be apprised that the results of this examination would be viewed and considered by the summer faculty before candidates were admitted to the College of Law. In fact, the faculty had not changed their minds about basing admission and scholarship decisions solely upon summer program performance, but they did desire that the students taking the Law School Admission Test be prepared, both consciously and unconsciously, to do their best.

The results on this examination ranged from a high of 588 to a low of 268. The average score was 431.[19]

For comparison purposes, it might be interesting to note that the present average LSAT score for admittees to the College of Law on a regular admission basis is 567.

D. Report of Professor Anthony Gary Dworkin

Through Professor Richard D. Schwartz of Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, Dean Yegge learned of a member of the Northwestern faculty who has spent a great deal of time studying the problems of the Spanish-American community and who is extremely interested in working with, and helping to solve the problems of, the members of the Spanish-American community.

---

[19] See Appendix L for a chart indicating the results on both Law School Admission Tests.

Because of this helpful lead, contact was made with Professor Anthony Gary Dworkin. He was apprised of the existence and operation of our special summer preparatory program, and he was invited to come to the College of Law in July, 1967. Our desire was that he view our program in operation, meet the faculty, meet and talk with the students participating in the program, and help the faculty to perceive and resolve whatever problems might exist. Professor Dworkin accepted our offer and arrived at the College of Law on July 3, 1967 and remained on the scene until July 8. He had a full week in which to get to know the faculty and the students and to evaluate the program.

During the week Professor Dworkin was present at the College of Law, he attended both classes and tutorial sessions in each subject. He had an opportunity to visit with the entire faculty and the teaching assistants at a luncheon on Wednesday, July 5, and he had numerous opportunities to talk with individual members of the faculty and teaching assistants throughout the week.

Professor Dworkin visited informally with the students in the program, having a chance to talk to each student at least once, and talking with most of the students on three or four occasions. He had opportunities to talk with the students individually, and also opportunities to talk with them over coffee in small groups of five or six students.

On Thursday, July 6, 1967, Professor Dworkin administered a survey to the students participating in the summer program. Based upon this survey and upon his opportunity to talk with the students, Professor Dworkin concluded that our students were not typical of the members of the Spanish-American community he had known in the larger cities of California. He found, for example, that the words chosen by the students to project their self-image dramatically demonstrated that the students were significantly more ambitious, positive and self-confident than he had anticipated from prior experience.

He discovered that most of the students indicated they intended to return to their own communities to practice, which, if true, would have a tendency to fulfill one of the goals of the program, which is to increase the number of Spanish-American attorneys in the Rocky Mountain area. He found a rather keen desire, coupled with the asserted self-confidence, to succeed in the summer program and also subsequently in law school. He also found that most of the students participating in the summer program had a marked desire to be of assistance as lawyers in the betterment and progress of the Spanish-American community.

Through Professor Dworkin's rather unique posture of being in a position to assist the faculty, and yet from the student's point of view not being a part of the formal program, the faculty received some helpful observations about both the students and the conduct of the program. Through his intermediary role we discovered some minor grievances which might not otherwise have come to the attention of the faculty, e.g., the students' misconception that the faculty was sometimes unavailable to them, and some students' consternation over the faculty's rather awkward attempts to pronounce Spanish surnames. The faculty then was prepared to correct misconceptions and to work out other areas of potential minor friction.

While Professor Dworkin's activities and subsequent report resulted in no major change in the direction or in the conduct of the program, he served to assure the faculty there were no latent problems of significant proportions. It was conducive to the efficient operation of the program to learn that we had a group of students who were confident, hard working, interested, and who had no major complaint or untoward difficulties with their studies or with the operation of the program.

E. Extracurricular Activities

From the inception of planning, the aim had been to arrange a certain number of extracurricular activities for the students participating in this summer's program. However, it was decided to delay any advance planning until the program was well under way, for it was felt that not until the students were on the scene and immersed in their work could we be sure of the time, if any, available for such programs. Certainly, it was never questioned that the academic work must take precedence over all other activities. Thus, no extracurricular activities were to be arranged for several weeks following the arrival of the students on Friday, June 16, in order that they might thoroughly familiarize themselves with and adjust to the school, the routine, and to the work required of them. For this reason, nothing outside academic work was scheduled before mid-July.

At the invitation of the faculty, Roger Cisneros, Esq. addressed the assembled students in the summer program at the College of Law on Friday, June 14. Mr. Cisneros is an attorney of Spanish-American descent practicing in the City and County of Denver. He is also a Colorado state senator. He is a graduate of the University of Denver College of Law. He spoke for thirty minutes to the students, giving his understanding of the opportunities that are available to them through the study of law, to benefit both themselves and the community. He dwelt at length upon the many employment opportunities that would be available to them after graduation from law school. He was extremely encouraging in his remarks concerning the economics of law practice for an attorney of Spanish-American descent, both in private practice and in government service. The students seemed quite heartened at what could only be described as very bright prospects. Following the close of his talk, Mr. Cisneros was available for questions, and there was quite a responsive interest shown, with most of the questions being directed at his political activities and the economics of his law practice. At the close of the session several students remained to talk further with him.

As a further reflection of the keen interest of the students, I later discovered that prior to Mr. Cisneros' talk at the law school, several of our summer students had passed his office close to the law school and, noticing his Spanish surname, had called at his office and introduced themselves, talking to him about both the study and the practice of law.

The students toured the premises of the Neighborhood Law Office on the afternoon of Wednesday, July 19. Howard I. Rosenberg, Esq., the attorney in charge of the office, talked with them for half an hour about the function and operation of his office. The Neighborhood Law Office is a special project of the Office of Economic Opportunity, conducted under the aegis of the University of Denver College of Law. It is located in the heart of a poverty stricken neighborhood, and it has a staff of three attorneys. Mr. Rosenberg was very helpful in explaining to the students the objectives which the office seeks to accomplish, the day-by-day operation of the office, and the successes and failures which had been met. He explained in some detail the type of legal problems handled by the office and the approach that was given to each of them.

The afternoon of Friday, July 21, Donald N. Pacheco, Esq., a 1963 graduate of the University of Denver College of Law, and an attorney of Spanish-American descent, also practicing in Denver, spoke to the students at the law school. Mr. Pacheco was on the staff of the District Attorney for the City and County of Denver for a year and a half following his graduation from law school and he has been in private practice since that time. He has been quite successful, having earned a fine reputation as a criminal defense lawyer, though his practice is by no means limited to criminal defense work. As did Mr. Cisneros, Mr. Pacheco spoke to the students on the activities of his practice, and on the positions available for young lawyers, particularly those of Spanish-American descent. He talked extensively on his practice since leaving the District Attorney's Office. He is a very forceful and persuasive speaker, and the response to his remarks, as indicated by the questions following his talk, was very interested and enthusiastic.

The students in the summer program were taken on a tour of the law firm of Holland & Hart, the largest law firm in Denver, on the afternoon of Friday, July 28. The firm is presently comprised of fifty-four attorneys and occupies two floors of a downtown office building. William J. Carney, Esq., made the arrangements for the tour, and he personally conducted the students on a tour of the facilities of the law firm's offices, including the firm's library, the building library, individual attorneys' offices, the firm's file room and conference room. The students were informed in considerable detail as to how such a sizeable office manages to function mechanically, and at the close of the tour the students gathered in the firm's conference room where they were addressed by Mr. Carney and by another associate, H. Gregory Austin, Esq., and by a partner of the firm, Don D. Etter, Esq. They were given the opportunity to interrogate thoroughly each of the three members of the firm as to all facets of a large law practice.

The students also had one opportunity during the summer for an organized social function. This occurred on Sunday afternoon, July 23, when the summer students were invited to the home of Donald N. Pacheco, Esq., for a picnic. Mr. Roger Cisneros and his wife joined Mr. and Mrs. Pacheco in preparing for this social event. Mr. Pacheco's law partner, Edward O. Geer, Esq. a former Safety Manager of the City and County of Denver was present, as were many of the lawyers of Spanish-American descent who are practicing in the Denver community, including Bert A. Gallegos, Esq., Donald E. Cordova, Esq. a member of the United States District Attorney's staff, and Joe C. Medina, Esq., former

Deputy District Attorney and now in private practice in Denver. There was good attendance by the students of the summer program and also by the teaching assistants.

On the afternoon of Wednesday, August 2, Edward H. Sherman, Esq., the Public Defender for the City and County of Denver, addressed the students at the law school. He spoke to them on the operation and function of his office. Mr. Sherman is a very persuasive speaker indeed, and he made a forceful case for the need for the defense of the indigent, and for the high calling of the reputable criminal defense attorney.

VII

ACADEMIC RESULTS AND SCHOLARSHIPS AWARDED

As indicated in Section IV of this Report, by the start of the second week of the program, the Admissions Committee had settled finally upon twenty students, who are listed in Appendix F hereof. As noted, two of the final twenty students withdrew from the program before its completion.[20] Of the remaining eighteen students, eleven satisfactorily completed the summer program. Since at least a C average is required for satisfactory performance at the College of Law, the summer faculty imposed the same requirement upon the preparatory students. Thus, eleven of the students had at least a C average in the three courses taken by them, and seven of the eighteen had less than a C average. The satisfactory completion of the summer courses was the sole criterion for admission to the College of Law and the concomitant award of scholarships.

---

[20] See Section IV of this Report for a discussion of the selection of summer candidates and the replacements for students who withdrew.

As noted in Section IV, Appendix F gives each student's mark in each of his three courses, as well as giving his over-all average, and his class ranking, in the summer program. However, it might be helpful to discuss the performance of the students as a group in this section.

The grading system at the College of Law is graduated on the following basis:

A	85-100
B	77-84
C	68-76
D	60-67
F	45-59

The ranking student in the class, and the only student to earn an A average, received one A and two B's in his courses, earning an average of 86.6 for the three courses. Each of the succeeding seven students earned at least a B average, ranging from a high average of 83 to a low of 77.6. Thus, of the eleven students chosen to receive scholarships to the College of Law in September, eight had at least a B average.

The remaining three students who were awarded scholarships had C averages, ranging from a high average of 76 to a low of 71.

Among the eleven scholarship recipients, only two received a mark lower than a C in any course, and each of these two students received only one D mark. The man who ranked ninth received a D in Criminal Law (a 66, the lowest C being a 68), and the man who ranked eleventh received a D in Contracts (a 67, the highest D possible).

Quality work was demanded of the summer students, and it was received from the successful candidates. The average marks for the eleven scholarship students indicate the ability to successfully complete law school. Those who were capable of completing the program and handling the course work satisfactorily, in the main, did so by quite a wide margin. It is the feeling of the summer faculty that this indicates that a consistently better performance in law school can be expected than would be the case had most of our scholarship students been merely in the C range.

Of the seven students who were not awarded scholarships, two came very close to having a C average. The twelfth ranked man had an average of 67.6, with 68 being the close of the C range. However, this student made two D's, a 66 and a 63, and his highest mark was 74, a middle C. The thirteenth ranking man actually failed only one course, but he did so quite miserably, receiving a 54 (F). This man made a 71 (C) and a 77 (lowest possible B) in his other courses, closing with an average of 67.3. The next man in succession had a D average of 66. He also had earned two D's and one middle C. The next ranking candidate also had a D average, but somewhat lower at 64, having made two D's and a lower C. The next two unsuccessful candidates had F averages, 59.6 and 55.3, respectively.

The final student who stayed on until the end of the summer had an F average of 45, the lowest possible. However, this student, while not actually withdrawing, had early decided he desired to join the Peace Corps at summer's close rather than doing graduate level work. It was clear he was not trying to compete and his abysmal performance can thus be explained and should be treated as an aberration.

In summary, the academic performance of the summer students was considerably more than acceptable at the upper ranges. However, at the lower ranges the performance was quite dismal. The summer faculty regretted being unable to fill the total number of scholarships available, having to allow one scholarship to pass unfilled. It was this latter lapse, together with the lamentable performance in the lower rankings, which prompted the recommendation[21] that more than twenty candidates be taken into the summer program if it is repeated in the summer of 1968.

Immediately after the close of the summer program and the selection of scholarship students, each participant was promptly informed by mail of his status. Most had been informed personally by the director of the Admission Committee's decision as early as Friday afternoon, August 18.

The Public Relations Office of the University of Denver prepared a press release describing the program and the successful scholarship candidates, and this was released for publication in late August.

VIII

ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS BY INSTRUCTORS

The following remarks have been gleaned from the three informal reports submitted by the members of the summer faculty after the close of the summer session. It will be obvious that there is unanimity of opinion in many areas, although there are instances where divergence is reflected. It would appear to be the consensus of opinion that, at least by the close of the summer, the students in the summer program could be said to have reflected the varied range of performance common to any law school class.

However, there is some feeling that at the start of the summer, with the exception of a very few entering students, the preparatory students were not qualified to compete with regular beginning law students with any laudable degree of success. There were notable instances, often with too much universality, of slovenliness, particularly in written work, but also in reasoning. There was some feeling that this attitude and approach, had it been allowed to continue, would inevitably have resulted in many of the students failing examinations at the close of the term.

---

[21] See Section X of this Report.

In this regard, however, the very intensive nature of the program and, in some instances, the harsh professorial criticism of both trial examinations and first efforts at research papers managed to produce rather dramatic improvement.

The thrust of this comment is that, while it cannot be proven, the summer program, particularly because of its intensive nature, was a decisive factor in dramatically improving the quality of the work and the level of attainment that could otherwise have been expected from even the successful students. Indeed, the consensus would now seem to be that, at least at the upper ranges, the successful candidates in the summer program should not only be able to compete successfully in the coming year, but in some instances should find themselves in ranking positions.

It can safely be said that, as a general rule, there was very regular attendance by the summer students at classes, group tutorials and in the individual sessions with the teaching assistants. Most of the students did all of the work and readings required of them and were generally well prepared. Indeed there is an indication that many of the students managed to do suggested readings which had not formally been required.

There is some indication that the progress of the summer students followed this pattern: that many, if not most, were not prepared for the rigors of law school work, as evidenced by the level of performance which they were initially demanding of themselves; that many brought a rather cavalier attitude at the outset to the preparation of written assignments; that following rigorous, indeed harsh, criticism of efforts that were simply unacceptable, the level of performance went up sharply, and continued to rise, at least until midway through the program; that thereafter there was some tendency among the faculty and teaching assistants to voice concern that perhaps they were being too demanding, not wanting to destroy by frost the budding desire of the students to succeed; that perhaps the students sensed this concern, and indeed perhaps the professors themselves unconsciously eased their demands somewhat, and thus the level of performance, while still commendable, tended to level and did not evidence the same continuing rise in skills and attainment as first observed.

Notwithstanding the mentioned leveling in the latter part of the program, the summer faculty was clearly pleased that, in each course, so many of the students received marks of A or B. While the entire faculty was always concerned with the question of whether or not the summer course marks can be relied upon as objective, vis a vis the marks of students in regular law courses, Professor Linn points out that two out of the three essay questions administered by him on the final examinations were questions that had previously been given to students in the regular contracts course in the College of Law. Thus, the answers to these questions gave an objective criterion by which to compare the performance of the summer students with regular law students. The results were convincing to him that the summer students had the academic ability to do well in the regular law school program. Certainly, it was the conclusion of the faculty that the outstanding feature of the program was the relatively high grades among the eleven chosen for scholarships. As previously noted, eight of the eleven had better than a B average.

IX

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED

Perhaps the most outstanding feature of the summer program was the singular lack of major problems which arose. Certainly at its inception the faculty anticipated there could be major problems flowing from the background, both socio-economic and academic, of the students. To our good pleasure, no such problems presented themselves.

There were a few minor problems which it might be well to record at this time. The selection of summer students had to be accomplished quickly because of the late start of the program and the need to have students selected in sufficient time that they might prepare to be present in Denver by mid-June. This particular difficulty would seem to be unique to the summer of 1967, and a similar problem would not be anticipated if the program were repeated in 1968. If the program is repeated, more time will be available for the preparation of publicity, for recruitment efforts, and for the selection of students to attend the summer program.

In this same vein, there were very minor problems in the actual selection of students to attend the summer session. Some of these difficulties can be cured by a tightening of our application form so that even more specific information concerning a student and his background is obtained.

There were some indications during the summer, coming mainly through Professor Dworkin and the teaching assistants, all of whom are persons who had a close contact with individual students, that the program was initially somewhat suspect because it was directed solely at the Spanish-American community. This is not to say that there was not great, indeed very great, appreciation among all of the students for the opportunity to attend law school and the tremendous opportunity of a scholarship program. However, there were some indications of a mild reaction because of a supposed implication of an inferior status and a feeling that perhaps one was being involved in an experimental program, with oneself as the experiment. It seemed these mildly adverse reactions were placated by careful explanation by teaching assistants and professors during the course of the program. Probably the most significant factor in alleviating such feelings was the good measure of success of the prevailing candidates, which certainly served to counter any idea that this was too much of a compensatory operation.

There was also a vexatious selection problem involving the marital and family status of applicants. As indicated earlier, the Selection Committee tended to lean toward single students, although several who were married were chosen to participate in the summer program and in one instance a man who had three children. In this regard, the committee is not certain but that it acted wisely, for among the married students there seemed to be a natural tendency to want to leave town and rejoin their families on the weekends. And, while it does not provide an acceptable basis for conclusions, the students who had children were not successful candidates. Thus, while this problem still causes some of the faculty concern, chances are that it would again opt to favor the younger and single student who had no or few responsibilities to occupy his time and divert his energies.

A selection problem which was only touched upon this summer, but which might become prominent if the program is repeated in future years, relates to the geographical area from which students should be chosen. The language of the proposal and grant which resulted in this summer's program was cast in terms of the Rocky Mountain Region. It was the feeling of the summer faculty that this included Wyoming, Colorado and New Mexico. However, there were seven applications from Texas and single applications from a number of other states. Indeed, two of the students selected to attend the summer program were clearly living outside the Rocky Mountain Region at the time of their applications, although each had been reared in the region and had obtained his college degree there. One of these students was employed in California,[22] and the other in the state of Washington,[23] when their applications were submitted. As indicated, there will probably be a greater problem in the future, particularly because inquiries were received from both state and federal government offices, and from private organizations, about the program. Many of these inquiries came from without the region. Since there are large Spanish-American populations in California, Arizona and Texas, consideration will have to be given to the issue of whether to broaden the reach of the program if it is repeated.

As indicated before, there were some difficulties in the administration of the Law School Admission Test sessions. While it is still believed that the scholarship selection process should be based upon performance in the summer program, and that alone, if meaningful statistics are to be gathered on the performance of the summer students on this test, the students must not be led to believe that the test is an irrelevant factor in the scholarship selection process.

---

[22] This is the man who ranked the summer class, student number 14 in Appendix F.

[23] This is student number 1 in Appendix F.

X

SUGGESTIONS FOR CONTINUING PROGRAM

Beyond cavil the faculty agrees the program should be repeated. This summer's program was very beneficial to those involved as students, both the successful scholarship candidates and the unsuccessful. The broad and enthusiastic response of applicants and other members of the Spanish-American community alone would indicate that the experiment should be repeated. The summer faculty feels that some valuable things may be learned about legal education in general, through the opportunity to use tutorial sessions and from the extensive employment of teaching assistants. The latter can be helpful both to the senior student assisting and the student being assisted. The chance to continue to use small tutorial group meetings to augment class work, and to use student assistants, in a limited summer setting, might allow the development of plans to utilize such learning aids in the regular law school sessions.

In the foregoing light, a number of suggestions have been presented by faculty members and teaching assistants. Concerning some suggestions there is a uniform opinion that they should be included in any succeeding program. Other suggestions are put forward for consideration in subsequent planning and are here recited so that they will not be ignored by default. They merit discussion and resolution.

It might be well, if the program is repeated in the summer of 1968, to undertake a program of personal recruitment in the very early spring of that year. It is envisioned that this would involve an automobile trip to colleges and universities in southern Colorado and in New Mexico, with pre-scheduled meetings with groups of interested students. It would provide a chance to engender enthusiasm, to clarify the program and induce those who might be mistaken about its object, or its application to them, to apply. Certainly arrangements would also be made to visit all of the colleges and universities in the Denver metropolitan area.

A majority of this summer's faculty felt in any succeeding program it would be well to take a larger group of summer students. It was quite disappointing to have one of the twenty students chosen not appear at the appointed time and to have two others withdraw from the program in the initial days of the session. While these three positions were filled this summer, it was not done without some reluctance, arising because of the haste with which the replacements had to be accomplished. And, it is well to note that not one of the three alternate candidates who took these positions was among the successful competitors. The faculty was also disappointed at having enough funds available for twelve scholarships and being in a position to award only eleven. Another reason which prompts the suggestion for a larger summer group is the rather abysmal performance, in general, of the unsuccessful candidates. It was felt that by accepting a larger group--both twenty-five and thirty students have been mentioned as possibilities--the necessity to fill vacated positions would be eliminated, and the chances of having a greater record of success by more students would be heightened.

Suggestion was also made that consideration be given to utilizing a "mixed" group of students during the summer program. The major thrust would still be toward the Spanish-American community, and the publicity for the program should be heavily directed to that end. However, the program might include several negro students from the Denver area, and also a number of "anglo" students who might not otherwise have been admitted in the regular admissions process. It was thought that the latter could be selected from students who had been rejected by the College of Law, but who might like to attend, at their own expense, such a preparatory program. The suggestion was also made that we include two or three students who had been admitted to the College of Law on a regular admission basis and who planned to attend the succeeding September, allowing these people to participate in the summer program at their own expense. Their work could serve as a comparison for the performance of the other students in the program.

In view of the vast amount of writing requirements in the summer program, and in law school work in general, the offering of a typing course during the summer session has been mentioned. This can generally be arranged with a very small commitment of time by the student. Opportunities for such a course might be available through the University of Denver or through the Emily Griffith Opportunity School in downtown Denver. In this line, a suggestion has been made that the utilization of a course in speed reading be discussed.

If the selection of summer students in a succeeding year can take place early enough, consideration could be given to making available to each candidate selected a general text on the study of law. This would involve first the selection of a suitable piece. It would then involve the distribution of this book to the candidates in sufficient time so that they might read and study it prior to their arrival in Denver.

Further study is to be given to how the successful students in the summer program can be involved in the current student practice programs at the College of Law during their law school careers, how they can be placed in law offices for the gaining of experience, and what other experiences might prove beneficial to them during their student days.[24]

---

24. On June 24, 1967 this problem was explored somewhat at an all-day conference called by Dean Robert B. Yegge on the subject of the student practice programs of the College of Law, attended by law professors, students, sociologists, the directors of the current practice programs, judges, practicing attorneys and the director of the summer program.

Along this same line, further study is to be given to the nature and extent of extracurricular activities which can be made available to good benefit for the students participating in the summer program. One idea offered has been to arrange for the viewing of both a criminal and a civil trial in the Denver District Courts, which are located in the City and County Building directly across from the law school.

Another suggestion has been made that a somewhat more formal follow-up session with the unsuccessful students in the summer program be considered. While these students participated in the examination critiques at the close of the summer session, as did the scholarship recipients, consideration should be given to individual meetings with them, if desired, to discuss the summer program, the reasons for their failure, and what they might consider for the future.

XI

CONCLUSION

It is the conclusion of all who were a part of the summer program that it should be continued in succeeding years. There is unanimity of opinion that the program was very successful in its operation this summer. Indeed, as mentioned, the outstanding feature was the lack of problems encountered and the even greater success than had been anticipated. It is felt the future holds even higher promise, that the program has been of unquestioned benefit, and that future sessions could only represent improvement and progress.

Thus, this report is valedictory insofar as it describes the work of this summer past. It is hoped that it is convocational for challenging endeavors in similar programs in the future.

SPECIAL SUMMER PREPARATORY PROGRAM
COLLEGE OF LAW
UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

June 19 - August 18, 1967

INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS

Additional information and applications may be obtained from the:

Special Summer Preparatory Program
University of Denver, College of Law
200 West 14th Street
Denver, Colorado 80204

APPENDIX A

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of the program is to facilitate the entrance of capable young students of Spanish-American descent, in the Rocky Mountain region, into the legal profession. The number of Spanish-American lawyers practicing in this region is small and there is a great need and opportunity for Spanish-American lawyers. They could be of great service to the Spanish-American community, assuring competent counsel for, and advice to, and the protection of the rights of members of the community. In addition, lawyers have traditionally been active in business, politics, civic affairs, and public administration, and legal training for students of Spanish-American descent would tend naturally to give the community a greater voice in each of these areas. It is also thought young Spanish-American lawyers would have a salutary effect upon the ambitions and aspirations of other young Spanish-Americans.

II. SELECTION OF STUDENTS

To achieve this purpose, the Ford Foundation has made a grant to the University of Denver College of Law to conduct a Special Summer Preparatory Program. Twenty students of Spanish-American descent will be selected to participate in this summer program. By the terms of the grant approximately twelve of these twenty students, upon the completion of the preparatory program, will be selected to enter law school at the University of Denver, College of Law in September, 1967, as fulltime, regular law students. Of necessity then the summer preparatory program will be competitive.

However, the terms of the grant provide that the twelve students selected will receive full scholarships for their three-year academic careers, while maintaining a satisfactory academic standing. The scholarship will cover tuition, room and board.

Contact has been made with colleges throughout the Rocky Mountain region, so that application forms and copies of this information bulletin may be made available to interested college seniors and recent college graduates. Each college has kindly arranged to have a faculty member or administrator named to disseminate the application information.

Each applicant for the Special Summer Preparatory Program must submit to the Law School a completed application with accompanying photograph, one letter of recommendation, and a copy of all his college transcripts. The applicant may, if he wishes, send any other materials or recommendations to be considered. All applications and required material must be received at the Law School by May 1, 1967.

After May 1, 1967 the Law School will select twenty students for the program. They will be notified promptly of their selection and they will be asked to indicate their acceptance of admission to the summer program promptly.

Timely application for admission and timely acceptance if selected for admission are important.

III. COURSE OF STUDY

Students selected to participate in the Special Summer Preparatory Program will be at the College of Law for nine weeks, from June 19, 1967 through August 18, 1967.

Students will be given an orientation course on the use of the Law Library and legal bibliography, and will take four courses at the Law School through the summer: Contracts, Criminal Law, Criminal Procedure and Jurisprudence of Authority. The courses will be structured along the lines of first year law school courses. Courses will be designed to give the students an introduction to law and its study, and to give them an understanding of and preparation for the work, methods and responsibilities of law students. Examinations typical of those given throughout a law students career will be given.

In addition to normal classroom work, the students, in small groups (4 to 6 students each), will be given an opportunity in each course for tutorial sessions with the professor.

Field trips to courts, government offices, the Neighborhood Law Center of the Office of Economic Opportunity, law offices and businesses in the Denver area, and addresses by judges and attorneys, will be planned in order to familiarize the students with different careers available to lawyers. At the close of the summer session, the Law School will select approximately twelve students from among the summer program participants for admission to the Law School in September, 1967 as full-time, regular first-year students. These students, as indicated earlier, will be given scholarships (tuition, room and board) for their three-year law school career, so long as they maintain a satisfactory academic standing.

Each summer program student will take the Law School Admission Test to be given at the College of Law on August 5, 1967. However, the results of this test will by no means be the sole criteria for selection for admission (on scholarship) to the College of Law on a regular basis in September.

IV. LIVING IN DENVER

No special arrangements will be made for living in Denver. The Law School is located at 14th and Bannock Streets in downtown Denver. Within walking distance of the school, numerous rooms, apartments and boarding houses are to be found. Each summer student will receive an allowance to cover the cost of his room and board for the nine week term, and his summer tuition will be paid.

IN CLOSING

The University of Denver, College of Law Special Summer Preparatory Program will operate essentially as does a summer school session of Law School. All students should have a stimulating, busy summer. There will be a heavy load of course work, but there will also be opportunities for interesting learning experiences outside the classroom, as well as time for social activities with students and faculty. It should prove a valuable experience for all students participating, and it affords a rare opportunity to compete for and obtain a full scholarship for law study.

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER COLLEGE OF LAW

SPECIAL SUMMER PREPARATORY PROGRAM

Do not write in this space.

Action Taken

APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION

(Due No Later Than May 1, 1967)

Date Received

(Type or Print in Ink)

1. Full Name ______ (Last) (First) (Middle)

Social Security Number ______

2. Present Mailing Address ______

Note: This will be used as your mailing address until June 1. Thereafter communications will be sent to your home address unless we are notified otherwise.

3. Home Address ______

4. Date of Birth ______ 5. Place of Birth ______

6. Sex ______ 7. Marital Status ______

8. Spouse's Full Name ______

9. Number of Children ______

FAMILY INFORMATION

1. Father's Full Name ______
Address ______
Occupation ______
Highest grade attended, or degree received ______

2. Mother's Full Name ______
Address ______
Occupation ______
Highest grade attended, or degree received ______

APPENDIX B

3. Number of brothers and sisters: Older__________
Younger__________

EDUCATION

1. High School:

Name of School	Location	Dates of Attendance

Graduate of:__________
Date:__________

2. College:

Name of College	Location	Dates of Attendance

Graduate of (or expected in 1967):__________
Date:__________
Degree:__________

3. College major__________

4. College class rank, if known:

Freshman__________
Sophomore__________
Junior__________
Senior__________

5. List all scholastic honors and prizes which you have received:__________

6. List your major non-academic activities and interests to which you have devoted a substantial amount of your time while in college, indicating any positions held and responsibilities__________

7. Your hobbies? ____________________

8. Have you travelled more than 500 miles from home?
If so, when ____________________
Where ____________________

EMPLOYMENT

1. Have you worked while in college? ____________________

Position(s) held: ____________________

2. Number of hours per week:

Freshman ____________________
Sophomore ____________________
Junior ____________________
Senior ____________________

3. List employment positions other than during school year:

Employer	Position	Dates

CAREER PLANS

1. What are your present career plans other than interest in this program?

____

2. What other careers have you seriously considered? ____________________

3. Have you planned to enter a graduate or professional school after completing college? ____________________

If yes, state program contemplated (i.e., medicine, law, etc.): ____________________

MISCELLANEOUS

1. Have you taken the Law School Admission Test?______________________

If so, give date, place and score________________________________

2. Have you been in military service?__________________________

If so, give branch, period of service, and nature of discharge__________

3. Are you eligible for educational assistance under the Veteran's Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966?___________________________

4. What is your current draft classification?________________________

5. Answer "yes" or "no" to the following questions:

   a) Have you ever used any other name than that given above:__________

   b) Have you ever been dropped, suspended or expelled from any school, college or university?__________________________________

   c) Have you ever been arrested or charged with a crime?______________

   d) Have you ever been a party to a law suit, including divorce?________

   e) Have you ever belonged to an organization whose purpose it is to overthrow the U. S. Government?____________________________

   f) Were you ever subjected to military disciplinary action?___________

   g) Have you ever been denied admission to any profession?_____________

   If your answer to any of the above questions is "yes", please submit a letter with this application explaining the circumstances in full.

6. Who is your present source of support?_____________________________

Close estimate of gross annual income______________________________

I hereby certify that the information given by me on this application is complete and accurate in all respects.

____

Date

____

Signature of Applicant

APPENDIX B

The following colleges and universities were contacted in early March, 1967, with notification of the proposed program and with a request that a contact representative be selected:

Adams State College of Colorado *
Alamosa, Colorado 81101

University of Albuquerque *
St. Joseph Place, N.W.
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87105

University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80302

The Colorado College
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903

Colorado School of Mines *
Golden, Colorado 80401

Colorado State College *
Greeley, Colorado 80631

Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521

University of Denver *
Denver, Colorado 80210

Eastern New Mexico University *
Portales, New Mexico 88130

Lorretto Heights College *
3001 South Federal Blvd.
Denver, Colorado 80236

University of New Mexico *
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

New Mexico Highlands University *
Las Vegas, New Mexico 87701

New Mexico State University *
University Park, New Mexico 88070

New Mexico Western College
Silver City, New Mexico 88061

APPENDIX C

Regis College *
West 50th & Lowell Blvd.
Denver, Colorado 80221

Temple Buell College
(formerly Colorado Women's College)
Denver, Colorado 80220

University of Wyoming *
Laramie, Wyoming 82071

Western State College of Colorado
Gunnison, Colorado 81230

* Indicates a contact representative was available.

NEWS FROM THE FORD FOUNDATION

477 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022
Office of Reports Plaza 1-2900

FOR RELEASE THURSDAY, A.M., APRIL 20, 1967

NEW YORK, April 20 -- The Ford Foundation today announced a series of grants to improve career opportunities for persons from minority groups. They included:

-- A program in Denver to prepare more lawyers of Spanish-American descent;

* * *

With a grant of $150,000, the University of Denver will conduct the first program in the nation that seeks to accelerate entry of Spanish-Americans into legal careers. Although Spanish-Americans constitute about 18 per cent of the population of the City and County of Denver, the area presently has only two Spanish-American lawyers in a practicing bar of about 2,500.

In the West and Southwest, many Spanish-Americans have struggled with poverty, trying to eke out a living from migratory farm work. Like other minority groups in other sections of the nation, they have had fewer educational opportunities than most of the rest of the population.

With the grant, the University of Denver's College of Law will select persons of Spanish-American descent who are graduating from Colorado state colleges, and who would be unable to pursue a legal education because of finances and law school admissions tests. Special legal and remedial training will be provided in an intensive summer program, and the students will receive advisory and tutorial assistance during three years of the regular law-school course. The students will take the law school admission tests, but admission will depend on assessment of their potential as demonstrated in college. They will receive funds for tuition and room and board.

The university hopes that the experiment will help law schools in general learn more about what should be done for minority group candidates and that it will help meet a serious need for more legal practitioners from the Spanish-American population. Similar Foundation support has been provided in the past for programs at Howard University and the University of Mississippi Law School to help provide more opportunities in legal training for Negroes.*

Most of the graduates of the Denver program will probably go on to work in prosecutors' offices, legal aid and public defender offices, or governmental agencies.

---

* $1.8 million grant to Howard University, 1964; $437,000 grant to the University of Mississippi, 1965.

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICE 2120 South Josephine, Denver, Colorado

Area collegians of Spanish-American descent who are interested in pursuing a law degree with all expenses paid, are invited to apply for a University of Denver grant just made available through Ford Foundation funds. University Law Dean Robert Yegge announced Thursday that applications are now open for 20 scholarships permitting Spanish-Americans to seek a law degree.

Applicants will be accepted under a program designed to help prepare more lawyers of Spanish-American descent. In a nine-week summer session beginning June 19, law school candidates will take introductory law courses and be given special advisory and tutorial counseling to prepare them for entry into regular law school sessions beginning this fall. Director of the program is William Huff, assistant professor of law at the University of Denver.

Students accepted for the summer preparatory session will receive a full scholarship covering all tuition, books and living expenses. Approximately 12 of the 20 summer students will be selected on the basis of their performance in the summer law courses to receive a full scholarship to the University of Denver, College of Law for three years. Again, the scholarship will cover full tuition, books and living expenses.

The program is underwritten by a $150,000 Ford Foundation grant. University and Foundation officials hope the program will help remedy the present imbalance in the number of Spanish-American lawyers in the Rocky Mountain region. "The number of Spanish-American lawyers practicing in this region is small and there is a great need and opportunity for them," Law Dean Robert Yegge said Thursday.

He noted that lawyers who graduate under the Ford-underwritten program could be of great service to the Spanish-American community, assuring competent counsel for, and advice to, and protection of the rights of members of the community.

"Lawyers have traditionally been active in business, politics, civic affairs and public administration, and legal training for students of Spanish-American descent will tend naturally to give the community a greater voice in each of these areas," Yegge said.

Each applicant for the special summer preparatory program must apply to the University of Denver, College of Law, using an application form which can be obtained from faculty representatives at many colleges in the area, or directly from the law school.

Information and applications can be obtained by writing: Special Summer Preparatory Program, University of Denver, College of Law, 200 W. 14th Avenue, Denver, Colorado 80204.

The completed application forms are submitted together with a photograph, a letter of recommendation, and a copy of all college transcripts of the applicant.

Applications must be received by May 1 to be considered for the summer program.

Twenty students will be selected after May 1 and will be notified of their selection, and asked to indicate their acceptance of admission promptly.

####

PROFILES OF STUDENTS
PARTICIPATING IN SUMMER PROGRAM

1. Student No. 1
   Age: 27
   Sex: Male
   Marital Status: Married and one child
   Birthplace: Las Vegas, New Mexico
   Permanent Address: Questa, New Mexico
   College Education: B.A. (History-Political Science), New Mexico Highlands University, 1966
   Father's Occupation: Retired
   Educational Level: 3rd Grade
   Mother's Occupation: Retired
   Educational Level: 3rd Grade
   Undergraduate Grade Point: 2.63 (4)
   LSAT: 1st Test: 445 (Previous test: 399)
   2nd Test: 478
   Summer Course Marks: Contracts: 63 Criminal Law: 74
   Criminal Procedure: 66 Average: 67.6
   Rank: 12th
2. Student No. 2
   Age: 21
   Sex: Male
   Marital Status: Single
   Birthplace: Denver, Colorado
   Permanent Address: Denver, Colorado
   College Education: B.A. (Marketing), Colorado State College, 1967
   Father's Occupation: Pressman
   Educational Level: 12th Grade
   Mother's Occupation: Checker
   Educational Level: 11th Grade
   Undergraduate Grade Point: 2.25 (4)
   LSAT: 1st Test: Did not take
   2nd Test: 328
   Summer Course Marks: Contracts: 45 Criminal Law: 45
   Criminal Procedure: 45 Average: 45
   Rank: 18th
3. Student No. 3
   Age: 26
   Sex: Male
   Marital Status: Single
   Birthplace: Manzano, New Mexico
   Permanent Address: Mountainair, New Mexico
   College Education: B.A. (Political Science), University of Albuquerque, 1962
   Father's Occupation: Railroad Laborer
   Educational Level: 3rd Grade
   Mother's Occupation: Teacher
   Educational Level: College Graduate
   Undergraduate Grade Point: 1.35 (3)

LSAT: 1st Test: 468
2nd Test: 494
Summer Course Marks: Contracts: 82 Criminal Law: 74
Criminal Procedure: 90 Average: 82
Rank: 4th

4. Student No. 4
Age: 23
Sex: Female
Marital Status: Single
Birthplace: San Diego, California
Permanent Address: Las Cruces, New Mexico
College Education: B.A. (Political Science), New Mexico State University, 1966
Father's Occupation: Assistant Postmaster
Educational Level: 3rd Year of College
Mother's Occupation: Housewife
Educational Level: 12th Grade
Undergraduate Grade Point: 3.31 (4)
LSAT: 1st Test: 417
2nd Test: 560
Summer Course Marks: Contracts: 75 Criminal Law: 84
Criminal Procedure: 88 Average: 82.5
Rank: 3rd

5. Student No. 5
Age: 34
Sex: Male
Marital Status: Single
Birthplace: Penasco, New Mexicp
Permanent Address: Penasco, New Mexico
College Education: B.S. (Education), New Mexico Highlands University, 1959; M.S. (Education), New Mexico Highlands University, 1964
Father's Occupation: Deceased
Educational Level: Unknown
Mother's Occupation: Housekeeper
Educational Level: 8th Grade
Undergraduate Grade Point: Unknown
LSAT: 1st Test: 417
2nd Test: 395
Summer Course Marks: Contracts: 73 Criminal Law: 63
Criminal Procedure: 56 Average: 66
Rank: 14th

6. Student No. 6
Age: 22
Sex: Male
Marital Status: Single
Birthplace: Denver, Colorado
Permanent Address: Denver, Colorado
College Education: A.B. (Sociology), Regis College, 1967
Father's Occupation: Pipefitter
Educational Level: 12th Grade
Mother's Occupation: Housewife

Educational Level: 12th Grade
Undergraduate Grade Point: 2.27 (4)
LSAT: 1st Test: 417 (Previous test: 458)
2nd Test: 406
Summer Course Marks: Contracts: 60 Criminal Law: 63
Criminal Procedure: 56 Average: 59.6
Rank: 16th

7. Student No. 7
Age: 24
Sex: Male
Marital Status: Single
Birthplace: Denver, Colorado
Permanent Address: Denver, Colorado
College Education: B.S. (Accounting), Regis College, 1965
Father's Occupation: Pipefitter
Educational Level: 12th Grade
Mother's Occupation: Housewife
Educational Level: 12th Grade
Undergraduate Grade Point: 2.03 (4)
LSAT: 1st Test: Did not take
2nd Test: 378
Summer Course Marks: Contracts: 71 Criminal Law: 77
Criminal Procedure: 54 Average: 67.3
Rank: 13th

8. Student No. 8
Age: 24
Sex: Male
Marital Status: Single
Birthplace: Denver, Colorado
Permanent Address: Denver, Colorado
College Education: B.A. (Political Science), University of Denver, 1965
Father's Occupation: Deceased
Educational Level: 3rd Grade (Old Mexico)
Mother's Occupation: Housewife
Educational Level: 4th Grade (Old Mexico)
Undergraduate Grade Point: 1.54 (3)
LSAT: 1st Test: 348 (Previous test: 435)
2nd Test: 384
Summer Course Marks: Contracts: 83 Criminal Law: 77
Criminal Procedure: 75 Average: 78.3
Rank: 7th

9. Student No. 9
Age: 22
Sex: Male
Marital Status: Single
Birthplace: Rincon, New Mexico
Permanent Address: Alamogordo, New Mexico
College Education: B.A. (Political Science), New Mexico Highlands University, 1967
Father's Occupation: Janitor
Educational Level: 6th Grade
Mother's Occupation: Housewife

Educational Level: 9th Grade
Undergraduate Grade Point: 2.77 (4)
LSAT: 1st Test: 468 (Previous test: 428)
2nd Test: 422
Summer Course Marks: Contracts: 67 Criminal Law: 76
Criminal Procedure: 70 Average: 71
Rank: 11th

10. Student No. 10
Age: 23
Sex: Male
Marital Status: Married (After acceptance into the program)
Birthplace: Santa Fe, New Mexicp
Permanent Address: Santa Fe, New Mexico
College Education: B.A. (Political Science), New Mexico Highlands University, 1967
Father's Occupation: Office Clerk
Educational Level: 5th Grade
Mother's Occupation: Housewife
Educational Level: 3rd Grade
Undergraduate Grade Point: 2.55 (4)
LSAT: 1st Test: 365 (Previous tests: 1st-334; 2nd-340)
2nd Test: 433
Summer Course Marks: Contracts: 72 Criminal Law: 80
Criminal Procedure: 69 Average: 73.6
Rank: 10th

11. Student No. 11
Age: 28
Sex: Male
Marital Status: Married
Birthplace: Santa Fe, New Mexico
Permanent Address: Santa Fe, New Mexico
College Education: B.A. (Spanish), St. Michael's College, 1962; M.A. (Spanish), New Mexico Highlands University, 1963
Father's Occupation: Custodian
Educational Level: 7th Grade
Mother's Occupation: Housewife
Educational Level: 8th Grade
Undergraduate Grade Point: 2.51 (4)
LSAT: 1st Test: 388
2nd Test: 356
Summer Course Marks: Contracts: 83 Criminal Law 73
Criminal Procedure: 87 Average: 81
Rank: 5th

12. Student No. 12
Age: 24
Sex: Male
Marital Status: Single
Birthplace: Brighton, Colorado
Permanent Address: Brighton, Colorado
College Education: B.A. (Elementary Education), Colorado State College, 1965; M.A. (Psychology and Counseling), Colorado State College, 1967

Father's Occupation: Deceased
Educational Level: 4th Grade
Mother's Occupation: Retired
Educational Level: 3rd Grade
Undergraduate Grade Point: 3.57 (5)
LSAT: 1st Test: 405
2nd Test: 478
Summer Course Marks: Contracts: 50 Criminal Law: 63
Criminal Procedure: 53 Average: 55.3
Rank: 17th

13. Student No. 13
Age: 28
Sex: Male
Marital Status: Married
Birthplace: Wotten, Colorado
Permanent Address: Colorado Springs, Colorado
College Education: B.A. (Liberal Arts), Colorado College, 1962;
M.A., New Mexico Highlands University, 1966
Father's Occupation: Coal Miner-Farmer
Educational Level: 6th Grade
Mother's Occupation: Waitress
Educational Level: 8th Grade
Undergraduate Grade Point: 2.34 (4)
LSAT: 1st Test: 457
2nd Test: 455
Summer Course Marks: Contracts: 78 Criminal Law: 66
Criminal Procedure: 84 Average: 76
Rank: 9th

14. Student No. 14
Age: 22
Sex: Male
Marital Status: Single
Birthplace: Denver, Colorado
Permanent Address: Denver, Colorado
College Education: B.A. (Mathematics), University of Denver, 1966
Father's Occupation: Cement Sub-Contractor
Educational Level: 11th Grade
Mother's Occupation: Homemaker
Educational Level: 9th Grade
Undergraduate Grade Point: 3.40 (4)
LSAT: 1st Test: 491 (Previous test: 478)
2nd Test: 588
Summer Course Marks: Contracts: 84 Criminal Law: 80
Criminal Procedure: 96 Average: 86.6
Rank: 1st

15. Student No. 15
Age: 30
Sex: Male
Marital Status: Married and three children
Birthplace: Pueblo, Colorado
Permanent Address: Pueblo, Colorado

College Education: B.A. (Sociology and Education), Adams State College, 1962; M.A. (Education), Western State College, 1965
Father's Occupation: Automobile Mechanic
Educational Level: 6th Grade
Mother's Occupation: Housewife
Educational Level: 3rd Grade
Undergraduate Grade Point: 2.07 (3)
LSAT: 1st Test: Did not take
2nd Test: 268
Summer Course Marks: Contracts: 62 Criminal Law: 70
Criminal Procedure: 60 Average: 64
Rank: 15th

16. Student No. 16
Age: 21
Sex: Male
Marital Status: Single
Birthplace: Denver, Colorado
Permanent Address: Denver, Colorado
College Education: B.A. (Spanish), Adams State College, 1967
Father's Occupation: Deceased
Educational Level: 6th Grade
Mother's Occupation: Housekeeper
Educational Level: 8th Grade
Undergraduate Grade Point: 3.38 (4)
LSAT: 1st Test: 365
2nd Test: Did not take
Summer Course Marks: Contracts: - Criminal Law: - (withdrew from program)
Criminal Procedure: - Average: -
Rank: withdrew

17. Student No. 17
Age: 27
Sex: Male
Marital Status: Single
Birthplace: Reserve, New Mexico
Permanent Address: Las Cruces, New Mexico
College Education: B.S. (Business), University of Albuquerque, 1962
Father's Occupation: Laborer
Educational Level: 4th Grade
Mother's Occupation: Deceased
Educational Level: 6th Grade
Undergraduate Grade Point: 2.12 (3)
LSAT: 1st Test: 503
2nd Test: 472
Summer Course Marks: Contracts: 80 Criminal Law: 86
Criminal Procedure: 83 Average: 83
Rank: 2nd

18. Student No. 18
Age: 28
Sex: Male
Marital Status: Single
Birthplace: Las Cruces, New Mexico
Permanent Address: Las Cruces, New Mexico

College Education: B.S. (Business), New Mexico State University, 1967
Father's Occupation: Unknown
Educational Level: 2 Years College
Mother's Occupation: Housewife
Educational Level: 11th Grade
Undergraduate Grade Point: 2.89 (4)
LSAT: 1st Test: 342
2nd Test: 411
Summer Course Marks: Contracts: 86 Criminal Law: 76
Criminal Procedure: 78 Average: 80
Rank: 6th

19. Student No. 19
Age: 23
Sex: Male
Marital Status: Married
Birthplace: Pueblo, Colorado
Permanent Address: Pueblo, Colorado
College Education: B.A. (Social Science), Southern Colorado State College, 1965
Father's Occupation: Disabled
Educational Level: 6th Grade
Mother's Occupation: Housewife
Educational Level: 6th Grade
Undergraduate Grade Point: 2.74 (4)
LSAT: 1st Test: 342
2nd Test: 455
Summer Course Marks: Contracts: 81 Criminal Law: 74
Criminal Procedure: 78 Average: 77.6
Rank: 8th

20. Student No. 20
Age: 32
Sex: Male
Marital Status: Single
Birthplace: Del Norte, Colorado
Permanent Address: Denver, Colorado
College Education: B.A. (History), Adams State College, 1958
Father's Occupation: Farmer
Educational Level: 6th Grade
Mother's Occupation: Housewife
Educational Level: 6th Grade
Undergraduate Grade Point: 2.71 (4)
LSAT: 1st Test: 238
2nd Test: Did not take
Summer Course Marks: Contracts: - Criminal Law: - (withdrew from program)
Criminal Procedure: - Average: -
Rank: withdrew

FACULTY AND STUDENT ASSISTANTS

I Faculty

1. Huff, William S. (Director)
   Assistant Professor of Law.
   B.S.L., University of Arkansas, 1957; LL.B., University of Arkansas, 1957; Diploma in Law, Oxford University, 1958; LL.M., Harvard University, 1962.

2. Hurst, Harold E. (Criminal Law)
   Professor of Law.
   B.A., University of Colorado, 1936; LL.B., University of Colorado, 1938; M.S., University of Denver, 1940.

3. Linn, John Phillip (Contracts)
   Professor of Law.
   A.B., New York University, 1950; M.A., New York University, 1951; LL.B., University of Denver, 1955.

4. Tiffany, Lawrence P. (Criminal Procedure)
   Associate Professor of Law.
   A.B., Washington University, 1961; LL.B., Washington University, 1963; S.J.D., University of Wisconsin, 1967.

II Teaching Assistants

1. Beery, Sara J. (Professor Tiffany)
   Senior, University of Denver College of Law; Denver Law Journal staff; A.B., Wittenberg University, 1959.

2. Rode, James E. (Professor Hurst)
   Senior, University of Denver College of Law; Denver Law Journal staff; A.B., Wabash College, 1965.

3. Skillern, Frank F. (Professor Linn)
   J.D., University of Denver, 1966; A.B., University of Chicago, 1964.

APPENDIX G

SPECIAL SUMMER PREPARATORY PROGRAM

BOOK LIST

AND

FIRST ASSIGNMENTS

1. CRIMINAL LAW (Prof. Hurst)

Book: Perkins, Criminal Law Cases and Materials (Foundation Press, 1966)

1st Assignment: Read and brief Downey v. People, p. 13, and Grimes v. State, p. 16

2. CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (Prof. Tiffany)

Book: Miller and Dawson, Systems of Control of Deviant Behavior, Vol. #1 (Detection) (Mimeograph, Washington University, 1967)

1st Assignment: Read pages 1 - 21

3. CONTRACTS (Prof. Linn)

Book: Friedman, Contract Law in America, A Social and Economic Case Study (University of Wisconsin Press, 1965)

1st Assignment: Read and outline pages 1 - 26

APPENDIX H

SPECIAL SUMMER PREPARATORY PROGRAM
COLLEGE OF LAW
UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

I. COURSES June 19 - August 18, 1967

Hour	Course	Days	Professor	Room
9:00 - 9:50	Criminal Law	MWF	Hurst	205
10:00 - 10:50	Contracts	TWTh	Linn	205
11:00 - 11:50	Criminal Procedure	MWF	Tiffany	205

II. TUTORIALS

1. Criminal Procedure (Professor Tiffany)

Group 1	2:00 - 2:50	Lawyer's Lounge
Group 2	3:00 - 3:50	
Group 3	4:00 - 4:50	

2. Contracts (Professor Linn)

Group 3	2:00 - 2:50	Room 208
Group 1	3:00 - 3:50	
Group 2	4:00 - 4:50	

3. Criminal Law (Professor Hurst)

Group 2	2:00 - 2:50	Room 208
Group 3	3:00 - 3:50	
Group 1	4:00 - 4:50	

SUMMER FACULTY

Dean of the Law School - Robert B. Yegge

Director, Summer Program - William S. Huff

Professor Harold E. Hurst
   Student Assistant - James E. Rode

Professor John Phillip Linn
   Student Assistant - Frank F. Skillern

Professor Lawrence P. Tiffany
   Student Assistant - Sara Beery

APPENDIX I

APPENDIX J

WEEKLY AGENDA

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday
9	Crim. Law Class	Study Time	Crim. Law Class	Study Time	Crim. Law Class	Study Time	Free Time
10	Study Time	Contracts Class	Contracts Class	Contracts Class	Study Time	Study Time	Free Time
11	Crim. Pro. Class	Study Time	Crim. Pro. Class	Study Time	Crim. Pro. Class	Study Time	Free Time
12	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time
1	Study Time	Study Time	Study Time	Study Time	Study Time	Free Time	Study Time
2	Crim. Pro.* Tutorial Sec. 1	Contracts* Tutorial Sec. 3	Study Time	Crim. Law* Tutorial Sec. 2	Study Time	Free Time	Study Time
3	Crim. Pro.* Tutorial Sec. 2	Contracts* Tutorial Sec. 1	Study Time	Crim. Law* Tutorial Sec. 3	Study Time	Free Time	Study Time
4	Crim. Pro.* Tutorial Sec. 3	Contracts* Tutorial Sec. 2	Study Time	Crim. Law* Tutorial Sec. 1	Study Time	Free Time	Study Time
5	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time
6	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time
7-11	Study Time	Study Time	Study Time	Study Time	Study Time	Free Time	Study Time

*Each student will be assigned a section; when his tutorial section is not meeting, these hours will be study time.

1. This schedule represents a minimum effort for adequate preparation and mastery of the work to be assigned.

2. The "free" and "study" times between 12 and 2 p.m. may in later weeks be utilized for some extracurricular activities.

SPECIAL SUMMER PREPARATORY PROGRAM
COLLEGE OF LAW
UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

FINAL EXAMINATION SCHEDULE

COURSE	DATE	TIME	ROOM
Criminal Law (Prof. Hurst)	Friday August 11	9 a.m.-12 p.m.	205
Criminal Procedure (Prof. Tiffany)	Monday August 14	9 a.m.-1 p.m.	205
Contracts (Prof. Linn)	Wednesday August 16	9 a.m.-12 p.m.	205

EXAMINATION CRITIQUES

COURSE	DATE	TIME	ROOM
Criminal Law	Thursday August 17	9 a.m.	205
Criminal Procedure	Thursday August 17	1:30 p.m.	205
Contracts	Friday August 18	9 a.m.	205

APPENDIX K

FACULTY AND STUDENT ASSISTANTS

I Faculty

1. Huff, William S. (Director)
   Assistant Professor of Law.
   B.S.L., University of Arkansas, 1957; LL.B., University of Arkansas, 1957; Diploma in Law, Oxford University, 1958; LL.M., Harvard University, 1962.

2. Hurst, Harold E. (Criminal Law)
   Professor of Law.
   B.A., University of Colorado, 1936; LL.B., University of Colorado, 1938; M.S., University of Denver, 1940.

3. Linn, John Phillip (Contracts)
   Professor of Law.
   A.B., New York University, 1950; M.A., New York University, 1951; LL.B., University of Denver, 1955.

4. Tiffany, Lawrence P. (Criminal Procedure)
   Associate Professor of Law.
   A.B., Washington University, 1961; LL.B., Washington University, 1963; S.J.D., University of Wisconsin, 1967.

II Teaching Assistants

1. Beery, Sara J. (Professor Tiffany)
   Senior, University of Denver College of Law; Denver Law Journal staff; A.B., Wittenberg University, 1959.

2. Rode, James E. (Professor Hurst)
   Senior, University of Denver College of Law; Denver Law Journal staff; A.B., Wabash College, 1965.

3. Skillern, Frank F. (Professor Linn)
   J.D., University of Denver, 1966; A.B., University of Chicago, 1964.

SPECIAL SUMMER PREPARATORY PROGRAM

BOOK LIST

AND

FIRST ASSIGNMENTS

1. CRIMINAL LAW (Prof. Hurst)

Book: Perkins, Criminal Law Cases and Materials (Foundation Press, 1966)

1st Assignment: Read and brief Downey v. People, p. 13, and Grimes v. State, p. 16

2. CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (Prof. Tiffany)

Book: Miller and Dawson, Systems of Control of Deviant Behavior, Vol. #1 (Detection) (Mimeograph, Washington University, 1967)

1st Assignment: Read pages 1 - 21

3. CONTRACTS (Prof. Linn)

Book: Friedman, Contract Law in America, A Social and Economic Case Study (University of Wisconsin Press, 1965)

1st Assignment: Read and outline pages 1 - 26

SPECIAL SUMMER PREPARATORY PROGRAM
COLLEGE OF LAW
UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

I. COURSES June 19 - August 18, 1967

Hour	Course	Days	Professor	Room
9:00 - 9:50	Criminal Law	MWF	Hurst	205
10:00 - 10:50	Contracts	TWTh	Linn	205
11:00 - 11:50	Criminal Procedure	MWF	Tiffany	205

II. TUTORIALS

1. Criminal Procedure (Professor Tiffany)

Group 1	2:00 - 2:50	Lawyer's Lounge
Group 2	3:00 - 3:50	
Group 3	4:00 - 4:50	

2. Contracts (Professor Linn)

Group 3	2:00 - 2:50	Room 208
Group 1	3:00 - 3:50	
Group 2	4:00 - 4:50	

3. Criminal Law (Professor Hurst)

Group 2	2:00 - 2:50	Room 208
Group 3	3:00 - 3:50	
Group 1	4:00 - 4:50	

SUMMER FACULTY

Dean of the Law School - Robert B. Yegge

Director, Summer Program - William S. Huff

Professor Harold E. Hurst
Student Assistant - James E. Rode

Professor John Phillip Linn
Student Assistant - Frank F. Skillern

Professor Lawrence P. Tiffany
Student Assistant - Sara Beery

APPENDIX I

APPENDIX J

WEEKLY AGENDA

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday
9	Crim. Law Class	Study Time	Crim. Law Class	Study Time	Crim. Law Class	Study Time	Free Time
10	Study Time	Contracts Class	Contracts Class	Contracts Class	Study Time	Study Time	Free Time
11	Crim. Pro. Class	Study Time	Crim. Pro. Class	Study Time	Crim. Pro. Class	Study Time	Free Time
12	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time
1	Study Time	Study Time	Study Time	Study Time	Study Time	Free Time	Study Time
2	Crim. Pro.* Tutorial Sec. 1	Contracts* Tutorial Sec. 3	Study Time	Crim. Law* Tutorial Sec. 2	Study Time	Free Time	Study Time
3	Crim. Pro.* Tutorial Sec. 2	Contracts* Tutorial Sec. 1	Study Time	Crim. Law* Tutorial Sec. 3	Study Time	Free Time	Study Time
4	Crim. Pro.* Tutorial Sec. 3	Contracts* Tutorial Sec. 2	Study Time	Crim. Law* Tutorial Sec. 1	Study Time	Free Time	Study Time
5	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time
6	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time	Free Time
7-11	Study Time	Study Time	Study Time	Study Time	Study Time	Free Time	Study Time

*Each student will be assigned a section; when his tutorial section is not meeting, these hours will be study time.

1. This schedule represents a minimum effort for adequate preparation and mastery of the work to be assigned.

2. The "free" and "study" times between 12 and 2 p.m. may in later weeks be utilized for some extracurricular activities.

SPECIAL SUMMER PREPARATORY PROGRAM
COLLEGE OF LAW
UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

FINAL EXAMINATION SCHEDULE

COURSE	DATE	TIME	ROOM
Criminal Law (Prof. Hurst)	Friday August 11	9 a.m.-12 p.m.	205
Criminal Procedure (Prof. Tiffany)	Monday August 14	9 a.m.-1 p.m.	205
Contracts (Prof. Linn)	Wednesday August 16	9 a.m.-12 p.m.	205

EXAMINATION CRITIQUES

COURSE	DATE	TIME	ROOM
Criminal Law	Thursday August 17	9 a.m.	205
Criminal Procedure	Thursday August 17	1:30 p.m.	205
Contracts	Friday August 18	9 a.m.	205

APPENDIX K

LAW SCHOOL ADMISSION TEST SCORES

Student Number	6/17/67 Special Testing	8/5/67 Regular Testing	Previous Tests	Date
1	445 W47 B42	478 W43 B37	399 W35 B41	11/65
2	Did not take	328 W39 B28	None	
3	468 W39 B36	494 W47 B43	None	
4	417 W56 B67	560 W56 B59	None	
5	417 W35 B42	395 W30 B45	None	
6	417 W46 B36	406 W42 B31	458 W33 B29	2/67
7	Did not take	378 W30 B31	None	
8	348 W42 B46	384 W33 B42	435 W28 B45	2/65
9	468 W49 B34	422 W46 B37	428 W47 B32	4/67
10	365 W33 B42	433 W48 B40	340 W40 B45 334 W42 B39	2/67 11/66
11	388 W45 B43	356 W47 B35	None	
12	405 W38 B50	478 W37 B44	None	
13	457 W44 B41	455 W43 B43	None	
14	491 W45 B43	588 W49 B42	478 W47 B51	2/66
15	Did not take	268 W36 B34	None	
16	365 W37 B39	Did not take (withdrew)	None	
17	503 W41 B31	472 W51 B49	None	
18	342 W33 B38	411 W47 B50	None	
19	342 W46 B48	455 W47 B45	None	
20	238 W25 B36	Did not take (withdrew)	None	

APPENDIX L